The Congregational Quarterly

EDITORIAL

THESE notes are written while the coronation fever (the Earl Marshall's word) is rising to its height: they will be read when it has subsided. It would be foolish, if it were possible, to attempt an appraisal of the stimulus to the Commonwealth and the effect upon the world of so great and splendid an occasion. We are chiefly concerned in this journal with the Kingdom that cometh not with observation of which men shall not say, Lo here! or lo there! nevertheless, having by the abounding grace of God a citizenship which is in heaven, we have also a citizenship here on earth. We live in two worlds, like the pilot of an aircraft, whose machine, the air in which he flies, the clouds which he penetrates and the storms he encounters are manifestly of this material world; but there is an invisible world on which he is no less dependent, that plays upon his instruments to tell him where he is, his direction, height, speed and the hundred and one things he must be able to know at any moment. To deny this world of electric energy because it is unseen would be to make his flight impossible; but to be careless about the stability, strength and design of his aircraft and to ignore the storms he must sometimes challenge and sometimes evade would be no less folly. He lives in two worlds at the same time which, being parts of the same universe, are yet sufficiently different to make their separate demands which by skill, care, courage and faith must be reconciled. So the Christian must render unto Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's. The tensions between these two worlds make the adventure of human life, and cause us often enough to fall into dire confusion. But the New Testament never allows us to forget this setting of our life, and though there may be

> . . . one far off divine event
> To which all creation moves,

it is the movement rather than the end which gives us our present duties and opportunities. So we Christians are involved in this temporal world while our final hopes are set upon the eternal. We are involved in our several countries, cultures and civilizations and cannot contract out of them. We must even measure one way of life

against another, not as if one had all the virtues and another all the vices, but unafraid of the judgment that one may be better than another.

* * *

Though there may be some risk of foolish boasting and dangerous pride, it is not incongruous with our Christian life at this time to dwell upon, and even call attention to, those features of the British way of life—its justice, its freedom, its toleration, its energy, its arts and skills, and even its long experience of living together peaceably in community—of which we do not have, nor desire, the monopoly, but of which some parts of the world as yet have too little. We have these treasures in earthen vessels indeed; but much of the world has benefited from them and would be better for more of them. We, too, need to learn from other forms of civilization, which may be poorer but in some things wiser, as anyone will know who has read anything of the exposition of Indian religion and culture by Professor Radhakrishnan. But we believe it will not be without value at this time, when imperialism and colonialism as they have been understood since the eighteenth century are passing into history, to remind ourselves and the rest of the world that there may yet be balm in Gilead. For whatever may replace the older forms of the exploitation of the earth's resources, and whatever the new nationalism claims for itself in Asia, unless Britain and America put in money and men the prospects in many densely populated parts of the world are grim indeed. And even more clearly is this true in Africa, where some form of colonialism is essential until the moral and technical education of the African peoples is far more widespread than is likely for a long time. To imagine that there is a deeper sense of responsibility among the would-be rulers of the indigenous peoples than there has been, and is, in the British Colonial Services is folly. What is needed are practical ways of applying western skills and techniques to the peoples and the material resources which do justice to the human dignity of the people. The recent failures of large Government sponsored schemes and the current losses of the Colonial Development Corporation show that the way is not easy. Infinite patience and persistence in well-doing are called for.

* * *

These reflections arise out of the simultaneous reading of two very different books. In *The Irony of American History* (Nesbit, 15s.) Professor Reinhold Niebuhr addresses a long and eloquent sermon to his own people, which many of us will benefit from. The creed generally accepted in both U.S.A. and this country is that the chief end of man is to pursue the happiness that is based upon prosperity: yet this, says Professor Niebuhr, "is challenged

by every duty and sacrifice, every wound and anxiety which our world-wide responsibilities bring upon us." We think of ourselves as neither jealous nor aggressive, yet we have devised destructive weapons of awe-inspiring power. We cannot disavow their possible use, because the survival of our civilization may depend upon them, but if we use them we shall be smitten with a sense of overwhelming guilt. Niebuhr accepts "the duty of preserving our civilization," but he reminds his fellow Americans of what we on this side already have reason enough to know, that the act of preservation may create unpredictable woes. He tells us that the three things necessary to our condition—and survival—are patience, charity and contrition; and reminds us of Lincoln, "whose brooding sense of charity was derived from another dimension of meaning than that of the immediate political conflict." It is our duty and necessity to find such a dimension of meaning today, when "the urgencies of the struggle are subordinated to a sense of awe before the vastness of the historical drama in which we are jointly involved; to a sense of modesty about the virtue, wisdom and power available to us for the resolution of its perplexities; to a sense of contrition about the common human frailties and foibles which lie at the foundation of both the enemies' demonry and our vanities; and to a sense of gratitude for the divine mercies which are promised to those who humble themselves."

* * *

The second book is *Mau Mau and the Kikuyu* by L. S. B. Leakey (Methuen, 7s. 6d.). Dr. Leakey is the son of missionary parents who worked among the Kikuyu among whom he was brought up and whose language he speaks. He has also lived in Kenya for the last fifteen years on such terms of friendship with the tribesmen that he has been initiated into the tribe as a first grade elder. This most timely book provides information and offers guidance to the British people who are responsible for the government of Kenya. The underlying causes of native unrest in Kenya and elsewhere in Africa are firstly, of course, the breakdown of tribal organization through the impact of white civilization, but there are also the growth of population, which is linked with land shortage, and the growth of a debased pseudo-Christian movement which has neither the virtues of the old tribal religion nor of a real Christianity. We are reminded, however, that large numbers of the Kikuyu are sincere and admirable Christians.

At the root of the land problem is the problem of population which, as elsewhere, follows from the beneficence of western science. But it is explained that complications have arisen also because the first settlers some fifty years ago found great open spaces of uncultivated land which they bought when ownership

could be traced. But by tribal custom it is virtually impossible for the land to be sold outright. What the settler believed he had bought as freehold the tribe understood to be held on some kind of lease—the ownership had not passed. Now that the tribal population has increased and the people have become accustomed to a higher standard of living, the pressure upon the land has increased, but it is an interesting fact, which Dr. Leakey shows by a map, that the greater part of the White Highlands, where most of the settlers live, never belonged to the Kikuyu but to the Masai. These are some of the factors in a situation, imperfectly understood by the tribesmen, which have enabled the agitators of the Kenya African Union, about which the author has no good word to say, to plunge the whole country into terror.

Dr. Leakey passes from analysis to suggestions for building a society from which these sources of disaffection will be removed. He believes it can be done with justice to both tribesmen and settlers. But the colour bar must go. If the Kikuyu people can be properly asked to adjust themselves to a new order, the settlers no less properly can be asked to bring to an end a custom that is an irritant poison.

The author ends this much needed book by insisting that the plain teaching of Christ must be so presented by native churches and schools as to counter the pseudo-Christianity which has replaced, without changing, the tribal practices which have been driven into the jungle.

* * *

It is evident from the way the Mau Mau movement has spread that not enough is known about native beliefs. There have been similar movements before, notably the sudden expansion of a secret society called the Leopard Men of some fifty years ago. This was the revival of an obscure rite based upon the belief that certain individuals can identify themselves with creatures of the jungle. Similar beliefs were known in Europe in the Middle Ages and in the ancient world. But in Africa the cult can apparently be dominated by powerful personalities among the natives, and used to terrorize a whole district. In the days before the British protection native chiefs, whose authority was thus challenged had their own no less mysterious ways of dealing with these outbreaks. The need is urgent for a more systematic and sympathetic knowledge of native beliefs, of which most of us are only aware when these terrible perversions break out in terror and bloodshed. A partnership that will give life and hope to the native peoples as well as a livelihood to white settlers can only be based on knowledge, mutual respect and co-operative interests. Such a partnership is impossible until

much more is known of what the native peoples believe and want, and what kind of education is best calculated to provide the leadership they need.

* * *

It is no light task for the ordinary minister, to say nothing of the great majority of our church members, to follow the proceedings of the many important conferences which are being held in these days. It is one of the functions of journals like our own to make available something of what is being said and done by our leaders when they meet. So we are glad to print in this issue Dr. Leslie Cooke's account of the recent meeting of the Executive Committee of the World Council of Churches in Lucknow. We Congregationalists rejoice in the part which Dr. Cooke takes in the work of the World Council, and he will, we believe, be supported by the prayers of our people, all the more sincere for being informed.

* * *

These problems of communication of which our leaders and theologians are constantly aware are known in other circles too. A speaker bringing fraternal greetings from a Trade Union to the annual conference of the Workers' Educational Association advised the Association not to talk to working men in academical language. "When you talk to a man about extramural studies," he said, "he does not know what it means. I have to explain to him that it is a University with an off-license."

* * *

In June Dr. Nathaniel Micklem, well known to our readers as a contributor and reviewer, retired from the Principalship of Mansfield College, Oxford. Dr. Erik Routley has contributed the following note:—

Dr. Nathaniel Micklem has given just twenty-five years to the service of Mansfield, three as Chaplain, one as Vice-Principal, and the rest as Principal. It may well be written, by some future historian of our denomination, that our colleges have been singularly fortunate in their Principals. Looking at the list of names from Doddridge onwards, we recognize the rare distinction and grace which each in his generation has used for the influencing of denominational learning, politics and piety. Dr. Micklem, himself unlike any of those others, will bear comparison with any.

In three special ways he has added distinction to Mansfield, and through the College to our churches. His academic ideals have ensured a strict, sound, and liberal course of training for his students, the course adapted in detail to the intellectual and personal

need of each student, but the standard relaxed for none. He has become a familiar and greatly respected figure in Oxford at large; indeed it is common knowledge in the Faculty of Theology that when a student has asked leave to write a thesis upon some more than usually abstruse subject it must be Dr. Micklem who either supervises its composition or is appointed to examine it. His own learning is enormous, but more impressive, of course, is its co-ordination and organization within the framework of his faith. Mere pedantry he would never tolerate in himself or in anybody else.

Hardly less important than this has been Dr. Micklem's astonishingly wide knowledge of and sympathy with the ecumenical Church and its works. It is to be doubted whether any considerable nation exists which has not sent one of its sons at some time either to study at Mansfield or, at any rate, to knock at the door of the Principal's Lodging and to demand that hour or so of conversation which would never, at any cost, be denied. (The cost was in fact far more than most of us know.)

Finally, it is as a minister, even more than as a scholar, that his colleagues and students will probably best and most affectionately remember Dr. Micklem. He has, in high degree, that gift which so many of his brother Principals have shown, and which is so indispensable—the gift of being just what you want when you want him. Friendly, unshockable, cheerful, courteous he always is. He has always been, perhaps, a rather dangerous person to know *slightly;* you might, in that case, have taken his humour for frivolity and his culture for sophistication. But happy are they who have learned what a mistake this is, and learned it by discovering the bottomless depth of loyalty to his Church, his 'men', and his Lord which are in him. For the humour and the skill of tongue are no top-dressing. They are the outward signs of a buoyant Christian spirit and a mental and spiritual keenness which have been, these twenty years, made available to all who needed them.

* * *

We are glad to know that a memorial to the late Principal A. J. Grieve of Lancashire College is being considered, and that it is hoped to associate with it the publication of a *Memoir* with some account of his life and work.

The Reverend Charles Surman, 4 Holly Lane, Erdington, Birmingham, 24, has undertaken to receive material that may be of use and will be glad of the loan of letters, postcards, appropriate articles and news items. Recollections of the Doctor's *obiter dicta* and notes of noteworthy personal experiences will be especially welcome. Material lent will, of course, be returned in due course.

MAN AND THE STATE[1]

By Rt. Hon. Lord Reith, P.C., G.C.V.O., G.B.E., C.B., T.D., D.C.L., Ll.D.

I DISLIKE talking—more than dislike it; and there's so much of it, amounting to so little; such a torrent of talk—clichés, civil sayings, passing the time of day—and the buck—or merely passing the time; banal, trivial, vapid; one of the few things they haven't thought of rationing or taxing or supertaxing.

Most of the men on the rostrum or in the pulpit aren't as impressive or convincing as they used to be; and we've wondered why. It's partly because there seems to be an embargo on emotion; on conviction and urgency. Partly because the speakers so often are not sure of themselves; timid, anxious not to offend. Partly because the objective may be less to reveal than to conceal; less to quicken or inspire, even to shock or frighten out of ignorance and apathy, than to flatter and soothe; to avoid being categoric and telling the truth, or anyhow all the truth, lest that mean having to give a lead—which they don't want to do; and which anyhow might seem immodest and undemocratic; partly because there's nothing much they believe in; because they have ceased vitally to care. And here am I come all the way from London to talk to you; to do what I so much dislike doing; and am so critical of others doing.

As to the subject given me, if I feel that neither man nor State is behaving worthily in these most critical days, I imagine you would expect me to say so. And I would rather have you in disagreement and irritation than in lethargic, amiable acquiescence.

Do you remember, from the book of Revelation, the messages sent to the seven churches of Asia; and in particular to the one at Laodicea? 'I know thy works, that thou art neither cold nor hot; I would thou wert cold or hot.' And the awful judgment follows that, because this Church was lukewarm, and neither cold nor hot, it would be utterly cast out. That's straight talking; and the Laodicean Church was thought to deserve it; it was taken to be in the final state of apostasy, or negation of religion. Poor Laodiceans.

Perhaps there are Churches for whom such a message may be brewing today—the Church of England or the Church of Scotland or the Free Churches? Let's hope not.

And apropos the Laodiceans, do you remember what the seven deadly sins are?—or rather were—for sins don't seem to matter much today; or commandments either—unless of course the State

[1]An address delivered to the Free Church Federal Council.

considers itself involved. Anyhow one of the seven deadly sins was called *accidie;* its best definition is 'a condition of not-caring'; and that was the major trouble in Laodicea.

Now we must look out; for a condition of not-caring can be not only enviable but estimable; an asset, perhaps a virtue. Not to care what people say, or think, or do—if you're sure your way is right; and if you're right to be sure. In that sense I didn't care when I was building up broadcasting and the B.B.C. It's a long time ago, and I can think of it quite impersonally. I knew that a great responsibility had—by accident—fallen on me; and that I must assess and discharge it by whatever light was in me, undeterred by, and indifferent to, the yatterings and chatterings—as from monkeys in the bush—of those who for this reason or that would have had radio developed without thought to its potential influence, intellectual or ethical; in fact without any moral purpose.

Now there's the criterion and the crux; the final diagnostic in broadcasting and the B.B.C., in man and in the State—that there should be a moral purpose diligently and faithfully and courageously set and served—in the life and doings of a man, in the life and doings of the State.

I don't claim any credit for what I did—none whatever; the light that was in me was lit in the Manse of the College Church in Glasgow; and it's to a saintly father and mother—if credit at all—that credit is due. But what I did has a relevance tonight. Let me put this to you—that there's an *accidie* fallen on man and on State; that they're not caring about things as they used to care.

Whose fault? Is the contagion working up or down? Has the man a bad influence on the State or the State a bad influence on the man? Anyhow what do we mean by 'the State'? If we hear it described as the body politic organized for supreme rule and government, we know vaguely what is meant; but a limited meaning it is. An amorphous mass of civil servants and officials; with a few politicians popping in and out; and the machinery of elections and Acts of Parliament; and regulations and more regulations; and taxes and more taxes. Is that all there is to the State? There doesn't seem to be much of a place for the man we're trying to talk about; and that won't do; there should surely be an effort at some sort of a summation or integration of the individuals—whatever that may mean—when we try to define the State. Let's leave it there for the moment; but you might consider what you have in mind when you refer to the State; and what it is *vis-à-vis* the individual and all the individuals within it. I'll come back to it later.

Meantime a warning; don't try to apply algebraic or geometric axioms and postulates to human affairs, especially not to political

affairs. For there indeed a single part may be greater than the whole, and the whole is usually a great deal less than the sum of its parts. Quantitative assessments alone just won't do. It's the attempted application, and in determinative ways, of purely quantitative standards to realms where numbers are only one factor among many, and probably the factor of least importance, that's as much responsible as anything else, and perhaps more than anything else, for our present overburdening sense of uncertainty and insecurity. We're in danger of being governed by numbers. Some day—and perhaps not so far distant a day—there may be a more realistic enumeration and assessment; for the State can't thrive or even survive on numbers and arms and gold and credit alone; but it seems to be trying to do so.

But let's look at the individual now, the man in the State, and particularly in the Welfare State. No doubt there's much to commend in the idea of the Welfare State; but there's much to be frightened of as well. I suppose there's bound to be a considerable balance of physical good; but I wonder what the overall effect will be. There's menace in it—in the Welfare State; and I'm not just referring to what it's going to cost, though the financial implications are serious enough. I mean the moral effect on the man from whom the State takes the unwilling money, as well as the moral effect on the man to whom in one form or another the State gives it. There's a moral hurt to both; to the former because he feels he's being penalized for being better equipped mentally or for working harder than his neighbour; and that, because he is better equipped mentally or because he works harder, he's given the burden of his neighbour's maintenance—and no thanks from the neighbour. A man ought to be able to understand and see the sense and perhaps the rightness of the reasons for which his money is taken, even if he can't be expected to welcome it. Otherwise he becomes resentful and discouraged; produces less; ceases to care—ceases to care.

And as to the other party—him to whom the State gives, isn't he in a position of danger? I've heard it said that it was a simple matter of justice that the better-off should support the less well-off, irrespective of the circumstances of the one having more and the other less. But justice doesn't come into this transaction at all. Listen to what Dr. Thomas Chalmers said about that: 'Whatever calls the poverty of a human being may have on the compassion of his fellows it has none whatever on their justice.' That was over a hundred years ago, but I don't think it's any less true now; the principles of justice are not a matter of current political or economic fashion; and nobody should try to make them so. Weren't we brought up to believe that it was wrong in moral principle to take without giving; to claim rights and dues without any sort of

reciprocal duties or obligations by way of service in return. And here's Dr. Chalmers again: 'A system that is wrong in principle is bound to be unsound in policy and pernicious in execution.' That has an application far beyond what we're talking about at the moment; and if only it could be kept in mind when this and that project, legislative or otherwise, is being considered and planned, we should be saved an immensity of regret and loss and shame.

Anyhow to get back to the Welfare State and unconditioned charity; it is one of the serious problems of the day. Perhaps, as the consequences aren't confined to the moral sphere—which nobody seems to mind much about—but become increasingly obvious in the economic, there may be a move to deal with them—though I doubt it. Do you remember how the Laodicean message went on—'Because thou sayest . . . . I have need of nothing, and knowest not that thou are wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked, I counsel thee to buy of me gold tried in the fire that thou mayest be rich.'

But there are many who, Laodicean-wise are saying: 'I've got all I want; security of employment, and I don't have to work any harder than I'm inclined to; I'm subsidized and taken care of by the State from birth to grave—I and as many children as I like; and I have the vote; and politicians flatter me and tell me I'm a wonderful fellow; and so indeed I am.' And if one were to ask if they weren't afraid of losing the old pride and dignity of self-respect, of independence, of craftsmanship, of honest and loyal work they mightn't understand what one meant. Even in this vexed field principle and morality can and should dominate and determine, all else subordinate thereto; however serious and urgent social and economic problems may be, to a large extent they're derivatives—and should be. Currency devaluation is regrettable enough, but moral devaluation—the devaluation of men—is vastly and terribly greater in concern and consequence. And whatever we may conclude about the make-up of the State, it's our business —or it ought to be—to see that the absolutes and the transcendentals are in proper perspective; the moral calibre of the State is a function of the moral calibre of the commonality of its members, and *vice versa*.

Never was there a time in international affairs when more was required of England—the precedence, as Milton put it, of teaching other nations how to live; when it was more vitally important that the contribution of which this country is capable, and uniquely capable, and which it is its peculiar privilege and responsibility to pay, should in fact be made. There have been many queer people and many queer happenings in British political history but, by and large, in addition to great wealth and great strength, there has been,

in the British conduct of affairs, the run of a moral law and a moral purpose. That we seem to have lost or at any rate to be losing; and in the losing we have become desperately the poorer. Most serious of all, though it's sometimes possible to recover lost fortune and strength, I just don't know if it's possible for a nation to recover a lost morality; it's hard enough for the individual. Who's responsible—the man below or the man above—the voter or the politician?

And now that the vote has been introduced let's look at that issue for a moment—the way it operates. To me it seems that the way it operates is a major cause of ill; ills national and international. Though I believe in democratic principle and purpose, I believe also that there's been an undue forcing of the pace of the adoption of democratic method; that in many countries—our own among them—democratic principle and purpose have been ill served thereby—as for instance by legislative measures that assume too much. There's nothing whatever reactionary—I should say only realistic—in wishing that evidence of some degree of intelligence and responsibility and capacity could be forthcoming as a kind of means test of fitness to govern—which is what the right to vote for the governors involves. Without something of this sort, or some change in the attitude of the governors, it looks as if one of the results of democratic method must be reduction to the speed of the slowest. Are we to allow that to happen; and that action and policy and purpose are set according to the least intelligent, least responsible, least capable, or anyhow to a low common denominator of them; and that principle and vision and courage and all the qualities of leadership should be indefinitely subordinated to expediency, popularity and the vote?

That suggests that the fault is largely with the voter; but it certainly isn't all with him. A good deal of it, and too much, is with the politician in his fear of the voter; a fear shown by a reluctance to explain unpalatable facts; a hesitation to risk the effect at the next election of pointing out the hard but necessary way. It wasn't always like this; not by any means; it's one of the effects of universal suffrage; but perhaps we may hope for a return of the sense of moral responsibility which, in varying degree and with few exceptions, lay on the statesmen of last century and the first decade of the present.

Referring to the generality of present day politicians a political historian comments thus: "Their thought hardly appears to range beyond material things; their energies appear to be fully engaged in the manipulation or mystification of the proletariat; in them the quality of personality is seldom now apparent,and indeed is scarcely to be expected in those who make it their pride or their merit to reflect the mentality and manners of the common man."

That's a solemn and serious indictment of leaders who aren't leading. And we don't know what they believe; or if they believe anything at all. Perhaps most of them don't. We wonder if they show so little sense of moral purpose because they haven't any and don't care, or because they think we haven't any and don't care; and if it's the latter, do we care or don't we? There's probably more truth than we realized in the old trite saying that people get the government they deserve. We would do well to think hard on that. But of course we must remember this—and here I'm quoting from the same writer as before—that the electorate hasn't much approved in peace-time of qualities of independence, unconventionality, initiative, and above all boldness of speech and swiftness of action in its leaders; frightened of it all, one supposes; of what they can't understand and certainly can't themselves achieve; probably also resentful. Irrespective of where the trouble begins and which side has the greater responsibility for it, we're all at fault if we put up with things as they are; and perhaps the politician is waiting—even though he shouldn't be—waiting for a demand. If the demand is made and he doesn't respond, then he doesn't merit the benefit of the doubt, and should be cast out.

And if there were any one association of citizens from whom more quickly and more emphatically than another a protest against an ignoring and abandonment of moral purpose and moral law in public affairs would, before the last war, have been expected, it surely would be the Free Churches of England. Perhaps you're taking action now, but I haven't heard of it. Or have the Free Churches also become rather hopeless; are they too in the *accidie* state of not caring, or anyhow of not caring enough?

"Two things," said a great German philosopher, "fill the mind with ever-increasing wonder and awe the more often and the more intensely the mind of thought is drawn to them: the starry heavens above me and the moral law within me." But today both starry heavens and moral law are at a discount. Man has risen superior to both—or so he thinks, or so it seems. He's not interested; neither matter to him in his daily life; he doesn't care. And as to the State, the civil servants and the officials aren't concerned; nor the politicians.

But is there really nothing more to the State than officials and Members of Parliament and machinery; depressing offices where people go for the issue or the stamping of cards; public corporations and nationalized industries and other bodies of that sort for which we haven't much good to say? If that's all a man has in mind when he refers to the State, we can't be surprised if he has given up hope and just doesn't care; in fact that particular sort of not-caring may be enviable and a virtue, as we said at the beginning.

And if the ideal in English government is just administrative efficiency and a balancing of budgets we're in a poor way, a very poor way indeed. Perhaps we can become administratively efficient, and perhaps we can balance budgets—though we're a long way off both; but even if we succeed we'll still be, if we leave it there, in the Laodicean words, wretched and miserable and poor and blind and naked. It wasn't to achieve administrative efficiency and a balancing of budgets that men have lived and died for England down the centuries—our own fathers and brothers and sons—and yet may die.

Can't you move in this matter? Can't our masters—yes, and our pastors—understand that more is required of them than they've given in the last decade; that we're waiting and anxious. That we want some vision lest we perish; a vision high and lifted up above the sordid but ephemeral tribulations of our daily life; a vision of clear shining to cheer us after rain; a vision of the righteousness that alone exalteth man or State. Can't we get out of this *accidie,* this terrible condition of not caring. Listen how the Laodicean message draws to its tremendous close: that incomparable and almost intolerable 'Behold'; 'Behold, I stand at the door and knock.'

All the messages to the churches end with a promise 'to him that overcometh.' And whatever these ineffable though presently incomprehensible images portend I believe they have a significance that will be revealed in the fullness of time—the white stone with the new name written; power over the nations; to sit with Christ on His throne; a name not blotted out of the book; to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the paradise of God.

The term 'tribulation' came up a minute ago, and we have plenty of it nowadays; but we had fair warning. 'In the world ye shall have tribulation'—yes indeed; but quick after the intimation of that struggle comes a word of encouragement—'Be of good cheer'; and after that the forecast of victory—'I have overcome the world.'

Some of us are desperately in need of guidance and help; I wish we could get more of it from the Church and in church than we do. We may profoundly believe, but we may also profoundly fail.

Do you remember Evangelist's reply to Pilgrim's request for direction: 'Do you see yonder wicket gate?' 'No'—unequivocal and final. 'Do you see yonder shining light?' 'I think I do'—equivocal maybe, but good enough. 'Keep that light in your eye and go up directly thereto; so shalt thou see the wicket gate; at which when thou knockest it shall be told thee what thou shalt do.'

And this final word to take home and ponder: that—to whomsoever overcomes—*'I will give him the morning star.'*

SCIENCE AND RELIGION

By H. G. Wood, M.A., D.D.

In all probability, if a psychologist were testing our free association of ideas, the mention of the words 'science' and 'religion' together, would at once suggest 'conflict' to most of our minds.

We have the impression that, since the Renaissance, science and religion have been involved in a constant conflict and that religion has been obstinately fighting a losing battle. Some imagine that the complete triumph of science and the elimination of religion is only a question of time, and that now it is only a question of a short time.

Personally, I believe, and I shall seek later on to show, that there is an inevitable and healthy tension between honest religion and genuine science, but I do not think there is, or can be, a mortal conflict between them, and that most of the so-called conflicts of science and religion have been conflicts between science and obscurantist theologies on the one hand, or between religion and pseudo-scientific philosophies on the other—conflicts between those who stood by established facts or probable scientific theories and those who mistakenly supposed that religion was bound up with assertions of fact which had been disproved or become highly disputable, and conflicts between those who saw clearly the inadequacy of rationalist theories of religion and rationalists who mistakenly identified the fallacies of naturalism with the findings of science.

The most familiar example of obscurantist theology in conflict with science is the quite indefensible treatment of Galileo by the Inquisition in Rome. The stubborn refusal to recognize the mythical character of the stories of creation in Genesis still persists in some influential Christian circles. It reflects little credit on the Christian mind. Dean Colet, writing not only before Darwin and Newton, but some fifty years before Copernicus, could see that the first chapter of Genesis should be regarded as a poetic fiction. The Church would have been saved from grave error and serious embarrassment if she had been willing to learn from this Oxford Reformer.

The positivism of Auguste Comte furnishes a clear example of a pseudo-scientific philosophy, with its illicit assumption that religion is nothing but a pre-scientific way of thinking—a pre-scientific interpretation of nature or the universe. The denial of the possibility of religious knowledge, on the ground that the only

genuine knowledge is that which is obtained and tested by the methods employed in the physical sciences, is another widely held prejudice on which scientific humanists and logical positivists seem disposed to unite.

If we recognize, as thoughtful persons increasingly do recognize, that past conflicts have been due in large measure to religious-minded people misunderstanding both science and religion, and to scientifically-minded people misunderstanding both religion and science, it is natural to look round for some delimitation of territory between science and religion so as to prevent future misunderstanding and eliminate conflict. Let each have adequate *lebensraum* and absolute sovereignty in its own sphere and all will be well. Cannot we devise a truce which may prove to be a lasting peace? This is what Tennyson is seeking in familiar, or once-familiar, lines in *In Memoriam,*

> "We have but faith; we cannot know;
> For knowledge is of things we see,
> But yet we trust it comes from Thee,
> A beam in darkness, let it grow."

Reverence and knowledge should advance hand in hand. Lowes Dickinson sought such an eirenicon in *Religion: A Criticism and a Forecast.* The finest exponent of such a composition between science and religion today is Dr. Julian Huxley. The broad lines of such an understanding are usually given in a series of contrasts. Religion is the realm of faith, science the realm of knowledge: religion belongs to the heart and to our emotional life, science belongs to the head and to our intellectual life: religion is concerned with the unknown and unknowable, science with the known and knowable: science has sway in the world of fact, religion in the world of value. At first these distinctions look hopeful and we seem to have placed religion and science in distinct, neatly separated departments. But closer consideration reveals that the matter is not as simple as we had hoped. Faith and knowledge, heart and head, emotion and reason, value and fact, refuse to be separated. We can distinguish them, but if they are opposites they insist on interpenetration and refuse to disentangle. What God hath joined man divorces at his peril. Try to hold science and religion apart in this way and both suffer; both in the end decay. In any case, the attempt to hold them apart is bound to fail. The terms of the truce will be rejected by both sides, because both science and religion deal with all reality, known or unknown. There is knowledge implicit in religious faith: there is faith implicit in scientific knowledge. There is no such thing as pure emotion and no such thing as pure reason. Fact and value cannot be simply opposed to one another, for existence as fact is a value—a live dog is better

than a dead lion—and true values are not just subjective fancies, but compelling realities. So we must think the matter out afresh, even if the contrasts give us some useful pointers as to the distinctive characters and functions of science and religion.

Let me then attempt to define the respective domains of science and religion. In scientific enquiries we are observing, classifying, measuring and experimenting. We are putting questions to Nature; and, to facilitate our enquiries, we analyse or break up the field of enquiry. We separate off this or that set of phenomena, isolate this or that aspect or department of nature. As Professor Levy says, science deals with isolates. Much of the time we are engaged in looking for laws or generalizations which include a number of facts; or, more particularly, we are seeking to understand natural processes which are, or which may be, capable of new applications in our hands and in our interests.

The purposes served by science, the motives inspiring our scientific activities, are three-fold. There is, first, the love of knowledge for its own sake, the satisfaction of pure curiosity. There is, second, knowledge sought for love of or interest in the object of our knowledge, for example, bird-watching as a hobby. Natural science may be, and often is, inspired by sheer love of Nature. Thirdly, there is knowledge for the sake of power, or control over Nature. It is important to remember that in so far as science is the pursuit of knowledge for the sake of power, it is concerned purely with means and not with ends. It can tell us how to achieve our ends, it cannot tell us what our ends should be. No advance in natural science can finally determine for us the good life. It can make us efficient, but cannot tell us to what purposes or causes we should devote our efficiency.

Now religion is concerned with the determination of life-purposes. As H. G. Wells said, "I believe" really means "I give myself to." True religion is essentially the recognition of and surrender to genuine values—values legitimately regarded as the highest. False or mistaken religion is dedication to false or over-rated values. Everyone has some sort of religion, some object of devotion which he treats as determining the purpose of his life, the meaning of his existence. The crude materialist whose philosophy is, "Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die," has his religion. As St. Paul says, his god is his belly, his ultimate values are food values. This is the religion of the Rich Fool.

We may conclude from this account of the domains of science and religion, first, that science is no substitute for religion; second, that science cannot conflict with true religion; third, that science is a necessary part of true religion and, fourth, that science is a corrective of false religion. So far from natural science being opposed to true religion, it is its ally. It contributes, in my

judgment, to true spiritual religion in two ways. First of all, every form of scientific enquiry is the spiritual activity of rational purposeful persons. Natural science is impossible for things and animals. It is possible only for persons. If we are just a part of Nature as things and animals are, we could never know and control Nature as we do. The one philosophy which is entirely incompatible with natural science is materialism, i.e. the assumption that human behaviour is determined in exactly the same ways and in accordance with the same laws as the movements of inorganic matter or as the processes and movements of living organisms. In scientific enquiry we stand over against Nature, questioning her, judging her. To suggest that knowledge consists of sense-impressions automatically systematizing themselves is not so much untrue as meaningless. We could not know Nature if we were not at one and the same time part of Nature and something more than a part of Nature. The earth may be, and in a sense is, our mother, but God is our Father, and it is our sonship to God which saves us from a mother-fixation to earth.

To me, then, natural science is a standing witness against materialism or any form of naturalistic philosophy. It is not indeed the source of my trust in God or of my conviction that we are God's children, but it confirms and reinforces my faith.

Secondly, the pursuit of knowledge, particularly in so far as it is motivated by love of knowledge for its own sake and by the love of Nature, is an essential part of the good life. It is not indeed the whole of the good life, and in isolation it does not yield its full satisfaction, but the best human life and the finest human character require this element, this delight in knowledge and in discovery. Knowledge pursued for the sake of utility and of power is also good in itself. The distinction between pure and applied science is convenient and necessary, but it is snobbery to pretend that there is something not quite nice or respectable about applied science. Such snobbery resembles the old prejudice in polite society against people engaged in trade! So, natural science, with its three-fold motive and aim, is a large part of those values to which we should give ourselves. In this way, natural science, in my judgment, becomes part of true religion.

What, then, does true religion contribute to science? First, it will help the scientist to give due recognition to the first and second motives, and help to save him from having his labours limited to the third motive or purpose, which would involve eventually making science the servant of the blind pursuit of comfort and power. And, second, true religion would enable the scientist to realize the full worth-whileness of his pursuits as contributing to realize the chief end of man, which is to glorify God and enjoy

Him for ever. Scientific discovery is a way of glorifying God. So is scientific achievement.

Now I come to my final point which is that, though true religion and genuine science are allies and lend support the one to the other, yet there is an inevitable tension between them, a tension which need not be regretted, for it may be healthy, but which must be recognized, since, unrecognized and misunderstood, it becomes unhealthy and causes distress. The tension arises from the fact that in natural science we are acting as judges and masters; in religion we are submitting as servants or children. In science, we stand aside from the object of our enquiry, aloof, dispassionate, critical, analytic. In religion we give ourselves away in adoration and surrender: if there is any criticism, it is directed against ourselves. The scientific attitude of mind tends to be concerned with aspects of reality which we sometimes mistake for the whole of reality. Religion is concerned with what is ultimate in the universe. Religion, like Art, is more appreciative of wholes and more appreciative of unique individuality than science. The difficulty of combining artistic appreciation of wholes with critical analysis of details is well-known from the way schools have often killed our interest in Shakespeare. The two should play into one another's hands, but they often do not. So with science and religion.

Science can give us all that we can know about the external world and ourselves so far as knowledge is a matter of classification and generalization, of exact measurement and of controlled experiment. But there are truths about God and the world and ourselves and our fellow men, which can only be discovered when we stop measuring and experimenting, cease to be critical and analytic and give ourselves away in worship and service. There is the crux of our problem. When ought we to be coldly critical, dispassionate judges, and when ought we to be passionate lovers and adoring worshippers? There is an old line about the man who could be so insensitive as to pry or peep and botanize upon his mother's grave. We have also heard of pious students who have tried to get through their examinations on nothing but prayer. It is possible to botanize when you ought to pray, and it is possible to pray when you ought to botanize or work in a laboratory. Herein lies the danger of theology: it may become the most profane of the sciences. There is a pertinent paragraph on this theme in Mr. D. G. James's study of *Scepticism and Poetry*. He wrote:—

> "Theology is, in a sense, a desecration of the superb poetry of religion: it destroys its magical power and gives us the dry desert of abstraction. That is not to say that theology can or ought to be done away with, any more than criticism and

> interpretation of great poetry ought to be prohibited because it is not itself poetry. Theology no doubt is a necessity doomed to end in failure which we cannot avoid. Yet, whatever value the effort to explicate dogma into theology may be, it is the contemplation of the dogma itself which is central to the Christian life. Theology may very well enrich that contemplation and therein lies its sole justification, as the study of criticism of poetry is justified only in so far as it enriches the later contemplation of the poetry. But considered in itself, theology is for religion a pernicious substitute, as reading about a poet is a pernicious substitute for reading the poet."

There is no simple solution of this central problem in the life of the spirit today. You cannot rid yourself of the tension by suppressing either your scientific interest or your religious interest. You must learn to combine them. What is true for the individual is true for society. Both the society which neglects science in the supposed interests of religion, and the society which neglects or denies religion in the supposed interests of science are doomed to decay and disaster. We shall make our best contribution to the world and to a new social order only if we honestly face this tension and seek to do justice to both sides of it.

Postscript.

Since this paper was written, Canon Raven's Gifford Lectures on *Science and Religion* have been published. He brings out the value of the contribution to science of the naturalists of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries who "had in common a sincere conviction that the works of the Lord were rightly sought out by His people." For those who believe in God the Father Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, the tension between science and religion is reduced to a minimum. They may find nothing incongruous between nature and grace.

REPORT ON LUCKNOW

By Leslie E. Cooke, B.A., D.D.[1]

In 1869 the women of the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States sent Miss Isabella Thoburn to India. The times seemed far from propitious. The fears and suspicions of foreigners aroused by the Indian Mutiny had not been allayed. Indian custom and religion kept women close wrapped against any social reform, and a school for girls was unheard of. In 1870 Miss Thoburn opened a school with six small girls. The result of her work is seen today in the magnificent college, with its 370 students, which bears her name, and the school with almost 1,000 scholars. The college, which has been a part of the University of Lucknow since the foundation of the University in 1921, and is now one of the three women's colleges affiliated to it, has a Board of Governors made up of representatives of the Indian Church and former students, and its Principal is the gracious and scholarly Miss Sarah Chakko, one of India's most distinguished women and a President of the World Council of Churches.

It was here that the Executive Committee of 12 and the Central Committee of 90 of the World Council of Churches met from 29th December to 9th January. The decision to meet at Lucknow was taken at the Executive Committee at Bievres two years ago. That decision involved postponement of the 2nd Assembly of the World Council from 1953 to 1954, and was made in the conviction that the World Council, because it is a world council, ought not to meet in the West until a Central Committee had been held in the East. That it was a right decision has been fully demonstrated. The Central Committee at Lucknow mustered some 58 members and substitutes out of its membership of 90, and was strengthened by the addition of 18 representatives of Member Churches from Asia and the Pacific, and a further 33 consultants recruited from fraternal bodies or by special invitation. It says much for the seriousness with which Member Churches take their responsibilities in the World Council that such a large committee could be gathered in South-East Asia.

The Ecumenical Movement as expressed in the World Council of Churches is the confluence of two streams of Church life, the one known as *Faith and Order*, the other known as *Life and Work*. The Faith and Order movement was in the main inspired by the

[1]A full report of the Lucknow meeting, with addresses, is printed in *The Ecumenical Review*, April, 1953.

vision and leadership of Bishop Brent, the Life and Work movement by Archbishop Soderblom. The other stream of ecumenical life is represented in the International Missionary Council with which the World Council of Churches is in association, an ever deepening and closer association.

The Amsterdam Assembly in 1948 saw the formal establishment of the World Council of Churches in a covenant relationship between some 147 non-Roman communions. At Amsterdam a Central Committee of 90 members was appointed to meet annually between Assemblies, and from that Central Committee an Executive Committee of 12 was elected. The Executive meets twice a year, once in the winter, and the second time immediately prior to the Central Committee. The association with the International Missionary Council is maintained through collaboration of the staffs of the two bodies, through joint action in the Churches' Commission on International Affairs, in Inter-Church Aid and Service to Refugees; and a Joint Committee of the two bodies meets regularly.

It has been my privilege since Amsterdam to enjoy membership of the Executive Committee and the Central Committee, and, as a representative of the World Council, of the Joint Committee with the International Missionary Council. It has been an inestimable privilege to have a share in the shaping of the World Council during these important formative years, to watch developing relationships, increasing mutual trust, and the growth of the Council into a body capable of advising and leading the Churches. It is, I think, true to say that today no communion, large or small, can afford to disregard in its own work and witness the strategy of Christian thought and action outlined by the World Council of Churches, nor can it separate itself from the life of the Ecumenical Movement without consequent impoverishment of its own life. The World Council can gather together the resources of the Churches in theological scholarship; it can accomplish the important task of mutual interpretation; it can exercise a ministry of reconciliation in areas where political and sociological factors cause estrangement, not only between races but between Churches, as in South Africa; it can harness and direct the aid of the strong to the weak; it can represent the mind of the Churches on current affairs where the policies of nations can be most influenced. All these things it can do; all these things it is doing with an increasing competence and effectiveness.

It may be gathered from all this that a meeting of the Executive and Central Committees will always have a certain kind of agenda, wherever the meeting place is appointed. Lucknow was no exception. The regular items in the agenda were dealt with—the

Executive Committee report, the Finance Committee's statement of accounts and presentation of the Budget. One of the remarkable things about this is that the World Council keeps on an even keel financially. The annual budget is in the neighbourhood of $360,000, of which $240,000 comes from the United States. Never once in the whole four years have our American friends exploited the fact that they are the largest contributors, or used it to influence policy. The year's financial statement gave an account of the completion of the renovation of the Chateau de Bossey. I have served on the small Building Committee which has given oversight to the work. This lovely old house, parts of which date back to the 11th century, is now completely reconstructed. It can accommodate about 120 people; it has its own chapel, modern kitchens and lecture hall. It is a School of Ecumenical Studies, recognized by the University of Geneva. There are 29 post-graduate students there. It is, of course, also a conference centre, a kind of laboratory of Ecumenism.

Regular features of the Central Committee's agenda, too, are the reports of the departments—Youth work (notable this year because of the Travancore Youth Conference), the Life and Work of Women in the Church, Studies, Laity, Evangelism, Inter-Church Aid and Service to Refugees, The Churches' Commission on International Affairs. All these come under review. The Lucknow Central Committee was noteworthy too because it saw the integration of the Faith and Order Movement into the life and organization of the World Council of Churches. Questions of the unity of the Church and its worship will henceforth be thrust right into the very heart of ecumenical conversations. All this represents the on-going life of the World Council. Behind it all is the creative thinking and statesmanship of Dr. Visser 't Hooft. His report to the Central Committee, always eagerly anticipated, puts the work in its setting, brings it to the judgment of theology, turns upon it the fierce light of criticism. His speech this year will be long remembered. He pointed out that the Churches are involved in the breakdown of society. He warned against any attempt on the Churches' part to offer secular panaceas. He spoke of the ecumenical malaise, the disappointed hopes of those who thought that the birth of the World Council would expedite Reunion. On the other hand he pointed to the achievements of the World Council in the realm of international affairs and refugees, and claimed that the Council is being used to bear witness to the Lordship of Christ. He looked forward to the Second Assembly with its theme of Christian hope, and summoned the Committee to recognize that the Second Assembly must stand or fall by the spiritual quality of its work.

All these things are a part of the pattern of the Central Committee's work, wherever it meets. Yet even these discussions gain

colour from the country in which the Central Committee is held; and the fact that we were meeting in Asia, with a large number of Asian delegates present, influenced the debate. At every turn the Asian delegates' conviction and enthusiasm for Church unity were revealed—nor did they mince their words of challenge to those of us who hailed from the West. Discussions about world peace were given touches of piquant realism by the contribution of Indian delegates with the effort of their own country to solve the Korean situation fresh in their memory, by delegates from Indonesia and Malaya, and Pakistan. Racialism is no academic issue in Asia, nor are social problems of poverty, want and refugees. It will be readily understood, therefore, that all of us felt ourselves to be very near the heart of that conflict of forces, on the issue of which hangs the destiny of mankind. Not in Europe, but in Asia, we felt, the critical decisions are being taken which will shape the future.

I want to direct attention, however, to six features of the Lucknow meeting which will, I think, make it historically important.

1. *The first is that Lucknow did the major preparation for the Second Assembly*. It dealt with the programme and organization of the Assembly to be held at Evanston, Illinois, in 1954. It received and accepted the report of the Committee on Structure and Functioning, of which I have the honour to be Chairman, which has been planning the organization of the World Council for the post-Evanston period. The organization of the World Council has grown up in response to need; it has hitherto been tentative, experimental: after the Second Assembly it will have a shape and pattern which we hope will increase its effectiveness.

Perhaps more important, Lucknow gave final approval to the theme of the Second Assembly, "Christ, the Hope of the World." In 1950 at Toronto a memorable preliminary conversation took place about the theme for the Second Assembly. At first it was thought we should make Evangelism the theme, and our initial conversations were on this. I recall the inspired and, in a sense, dramatic intervention by Dr. Visser 't Hooft to the effect that evangelism is a derivative from a conviction of the Lordship of Christ in the Church and Society. The Committee responded as one to this insight. A Commission of theologians was called together. Their first document produced at Rolle, and discussed in the Churches since, caused widespread controversy and criticism. Its dominant emphasis was eschatological. The Commission met again and produced another document, more balanced, more true to the Gospel, and this was before us at Lucknow. It was lucidly expounded by Dr. John Mackay, who asked pointedly, "In what way is Christ the hope of the world?" and answered, "He is the hope of the world in His final coming. The historical process is

purposeful—not drift. Utopias in history can never be ends in themselves. Nothing in history can be made absolute as though there were no end." This has contemporary significance for those who live in the shadow of tyranny and know the despair of these times. "This," he said, "alone can never inspire great crusading missionary movements. It can give courage, and tenderness, and the strength to endure, but not the evangelistic thrust." Christ is the hope of the world, not only in His coming but *in His calling*. There is measureless power here and now. The Presence of the Living Christ has overwhelming power in history. Those who hear and answer the call "Follow Me" know Christ as the Hope of the World. This gives the crusading spirit, the impetus to evangelize. The relevance, the significance, of this message is apparent. If the Second Assembly is faithful to it, if it refuses to be side-tracked from it, then there is no doubt of what that Assembly will do for the Churches.

2. *The second thing to underline about Lucknow was the discussion on Race Relations,* especially as they are illustrated in the South African situation.

It was unfortunate that there were no delegates present from Africa, but the General Secretary had spent three months there, and his important report was before us. That report can be purchased from the British Council of Churches, and ought to be in the hands of every Christian. It has had a not unfavourable reception in South Africa.

The South African problem is essentially sociological—the uprooting of the African people. The horrible part is the impact of modern technical society on people of simple, rural, collective life —leaving them without a policy to guide or to restrain them. The saddest thing is not the political situation, but this in which a whole population lose their bearings. This non-theological factor brings about disunity of the Churches. They are condemned by their involvement and their lack of imagination in approaching the situation.

Dr. 't Hooft pointed to the urgent relevance of the missionary task, and to the significance of the passive resistance movement in which some fine and leading Christians are taking part. He indicated the ecumenical miracle, in that it was possible to get Church leaders in conversation with each other when otherwise they would not have met. He showed how the Afrikaans churches were isolated because of language, but that on examination there is a large element in the Afrikaans community which is not as united on the race issue as would appear. The Churches are still a formative influence on the thinking of white people, perhaps in a way for which there is no parallel in the world. The day of opportunity is

not passed, although a day of turning away from the Church may come, and quickly.

The report created a first rate discussion. The American Negroes and, of course, the Indian delegates, so sensitive about South Africa, so versed in passive resistance, took their full part in discussion. The result was an amendment to the officially proposed resolution, which sharpened the judgment about racial discrimination, and called upon Christians to combat racial discrimination everywhere and to seek its removal from social and political life.

3. *The Work of Inter-Church Aid and Service to Refugees.* The third thing to emphasize about Lucknow is that it marked the opening of a new phase in this work. The story of this service is one of the most glorious chapters in the whole history of the ecumenical movement. The record is of churches aided, pastors maintained, theological seminaries helped to start work again, sick and undernourished pastors nursed back to health; of thousands of tons of food and clothing and medical supplies distributed, and thousands of displaced and expelled persons, refugees, resettled in new homes in new lands. It is hardly to be believed that about a year ago we were talking about the possible end of this operation. Perhaps more significant than the actual help given directly has been the canalizing of help from governments and inter-governmental agencies, for the World Council has been able to provide experts in their work and the most carefully documented information. Rev. Elfan Rees, than whom no one knows the situation better, made a statement which was exciting, moving, and challenging, to which the Committee warmly responded. This problem is a scourge which has come upon mankind, which the Church must fight as it did the slave trade.

The task of the World Council of Churches has been and is:—

(i) To place this upon the conscience of the world. (ii) To keep it upon the conscience of the Churches. (iii) To urge the necessary political action. (iv) To keep open the fountains of charity and goodwill.

Mr. Rees showed how the conferences at Hamburg in 1949, Salzburg in 1950, and Beirut in 1951, initiated by the Churches and bringing together Church leaders and government officials, had broken open the problems in Germany, Austria, and the Middle East, and had led directly to governmental or inter-governmental action. He showed that the problem has two aspects: (a) homeless people in their own country or in a country of ethnic cultural affinities other than their own; (b) strangers in strange lands for whom no government will take responsibility.

The world, stimulated by the Church, turns back to the Church

for help, so that the World Council finds itself confronted with a programme, and called to accept responsibility, for the use of large sums of money. Yet for the department to do this work, it itself has to be maintained.

The programme for resettlement in 1953 involves:—Liquidation of the hard core in Trieste, and the Philippines; 300 families for whom Canadian Railways have undertaken responsibility; 40 families a month to Canada; 30 families a month to Brazil; Austrian nationals from China for repatriation; Greek nationals from China for repatriation; 200 cases from Shanghai; 300 European families from the Middle East; and still there waits the need of Korea, when that need can be tackled. There is no end to the service. Already 160,000 are living new lives in the United States; Brazil is providing visas; Belgium made possible the solution of the Philippine hard core problem. Here is the story of achievement which gives encouragement, and of need which calls for further effort. If the World Council had only this to justify it, it would suffice.

4. *The Churches' Commission on International Affairs.* The Commission represents both the World Council of Churches and the International Missionary Council. It exists to advise its parent bodies on world-order issues, represents them at the United Nations and other international organizations, and collaborates with national Church commissions on international affairs. It has 44 commissioners representing 26 countries and 5 ecumenical organizations. The Commission has been most fortunate in its officers, especially in its Chairman, Dr. Kenneth Grubb, and its Director, Dr. Frederick Nolde, who have expert knowledge of international affairs.

The Commission has many achievements to its credit, in supplying information and interpreting the mind of the Churches on matters of Peace, Human Rights, Educational and Cultural questions, Economic and Social Development, Relief and Rehabilitation, and the Peace Treaties. Day in and day out the work goes on, and those responsible for the affairs of the nations are continually being apprised of Christian thought and opinion.

A significant statement was made to the Central Committee by Dr. Nolde, outlining the action taken in the interests of world peace. He recorded the efforts made to ensure the "containment" of the conflict in Korea, and in support of the Indian resolution on prisoners of war. He pointed out that although the resolution had been negated by the Russian veto, it had served to focus attention on the real problem, whether Russia had advantage in maintaining the war, and in that sense had provided indication of what the next

steps should be, namely, the changing of conditions so that such advantage would be removed. The Churches Commission on International Affairs had also worked in support of Peace Observer Commissions and technical assistance and economic aid to underdeveloped countries.

A statement was made about Colombia; the cases of persecution had been most carefully examined, and certain representations had been made.

Sometimes Churches and Christians individually express impatience with the silence or seeming inactivity of the Commission on these issues. The fact is that all the time the Christian mind is being made known. The dilemma is this:—Publicity would meet the Churches' impatience, but would often vitiate the endeavours that are being made. We prefer to be misunderstood for our silence, so that the real work may go on.

5. The fifth matter to which I would draw attention arises indirectly from Lucknow. We were privileged to have visits from distinguished Indian leaders, Mr. Nehru, the Governor of the United Provinces and Mr. Radha Krishnan, the Vice-President. We were honoured by them as they shared their minds with us. We were led to deeper appreciation of the enormity of their task, and the brave leadership they are giving. These conversations, however, served to throw up into relief that essential difference between the point of view of Indian culture that all things are relative, and the Christian conviction that there has been manifest in Christ an absolute and final revelation of the truth. This is the point at issue, and the most significant fact to be borne in mind in thinking of the witness of the Christian Church in India. I was more than once reminded of that word of G. K. Chesterton about H. G. Wells. "He seemed to think that the purpose of opening the mind was the opening of the mind, whereas I believe that the purpose of opening the mind, as of opening the mouth, is that it may be closed again on something solid." I had the feeling that if the mind of India is not to close on Marxism it must close on the Gospel, that the relativism of Indian culture will not in the long run avail.

6. That leads to the sixth thing, the whole changing climate of the relationships of missions and the Churches. The Churches are increasingly becoming aware of their missionary obligations. Churches created by missions are seeking their place as Churches in the comity of Christian communions; changes have taken place even since the last meeting of the Joint Committee of the World Council and the International Missionary Council last July. I shall not be misunderstood if I say that the day of the Missionary Society as an agency, laying a 'concern' upon the Church, and acting for

the Church, is passing. The day is coming when the missionary task and administration must be recognized, and organized, as integral to the life of the Church.

I moved from these discussions on policy to a brief visit to the Church of South India and to those areas where our own London Missionary Society has been at work through the years. I went to Bangalore, Coimbatore and Trivandrum. There I was impressed by the following points:—

(a) The Church of South India has come into being none too soon. The question remains, will it gather strength as an indigenous Church in time?

(b) My personal longing was enhanced for the day when such matters will be thrust right up into the counsels of our communions so that our witness at home and abroad may be discussed as one strategy, responsibly accepted by the Churches through their meetings and assemblies.

(c) Our confessional links must be maintained with the Church of South India, but maintained so as to encourage and support that Church in its development, not to restrain or to seek to make it conform to a pattern congenial to our historic prejudices.

There is an irritating practice of disinfecting a plane and passengers entering India and leaving India. There is also an element of futility in it. There is a greater futility in thinking that the East may be insulated from ideas from the West, or the West from the East. The social revolution is taking place in Asia. There, to any long-term view, decisions are now being taken which will determine the destiny of mankind. In those discussions the role of India cannot be over-emphasized. It is the one free meeting ground for East and West, the possible interpreter of East to West, of West to East. The future developments in that great land will have momentous consequences for us all. More than we realize, perhaps more than India herself realizes, mankind's future will be affected, perhaps determined, by the destiny India chooses.

ST. BERNARD OF CLAIRVAUX AND HIS IDEAL

By Geoffrey F. Nuttall, M.A., D.D.

The character of St. Bernard of Clairvaux, who died eight hundred years ago this August, like that of other great personalities, is one which presents brilliant contrasts, so that, with each facet sparkling, we are apt to be dazzled and to find difficulty in discovering the unity which was the real man. He was a monk, who loved to lose himself in mystical contemplation, yet at the same time he was in more than metaphor the dictator of Europe. He was an orthodox mediaeval, who (after Beatrice) plays the most important part in the *Paradiso;* he was also respected by Luther as the most pious monk, whom he preferred to all others. At least one biographer rests content with the thought that Bernard's worldly activity was but incidental to his real life; but such a judgment is not borne out by Bernard's writings, and in any case a unity there must have been in fact.

What follows is intended as a study of the things which made Bernard's character and gave him his individuality rather than of his actions and influence. In it an attempt is made to understand something of what was central to Bernard's life, his religion; and briefly to consider, first, its relation to his active secular life as a whole, and secondly, the way in which it affected his attitude in three particular spheres.

First and foremost, Bernard's religion was the mystical love of God. F. D. Maurice ventured the statement that "no writer of any age has dwelt more upon Love as constituting the very being and nature of God",[1] and the central dogma upon which Bernard seized was the prevenience of God's love. Man may search for God and find Him, but neither in searching nor in finding will he be the first. He may rise in the night to be down before service, but he will not anticipate God's watchfulness; God's love is both greater and prior. It is in close relation to this that we find Bernard expressing Pascal's thought, that no one could search for God who had not already found Him; for, though man searches for God in order to love Him more, he would not search at all unless he already loved Him, nor could he love Him without having found Him. This mutual search, this finding and being found of God, Bernard never wearies of describing, and in the

[1] F. D. Maurice, *Mediaeval Philosophy*, p. 124.

most superlative terms. A sweet intercourse *(dulce commercium)* he calls it, explicitly preferring the word *commercium* to the more legal word *contractus* (covenant), and the erotic language of *Canticles* is freely used by him. This he would have justified, had he seen need for justification, with the claim that no other language can less inadequately express the intimacy of the relationship between the soul and God. For love knows not reverence, so that the soul may converse with God in all familiarity, may become at one with Him, herself become divine *(sic affici deificari est)*.

Throughout Bernard's writings this experiential, or experimental, aspect of religion is given prominence. To his own experience he refers constantly, and counts it a sufficient guarantee of the validity of his statements. "By the revived activity of my heart I know Him." On one occasion he goes so far as to identify belief with discovery. He also fully appreciates the part played by personal goodness in enabling the believer to understand what Christianity means.

For Bernard's religious experience was a disciplined experience. Too often mysticism is divorced from ethics, but in Bernard's religion there is a strongly ethical element, and it is this which forms the seed in his mysticism from which his whole secular activity springs. When we find that it is by the disappearance of his vices and the suppression of his carnal desires that he recognizes the presence of the Heavenly Lover, by an improvement in morals that His loving-kindness is made known, we are less surprised at Bernard's influence outside his monastery. It is not that he was not contented with the life of mystical contemplation. With those who aspire to be done with meditation and be engulfed in the busy life of abbots and priors he has little patience. He knows too well what it means to be torn away from quietude to those who desire his help or advice. Indeed, he would not go, were it not that love bids him, but in the language of *Canticles*, which Bernard loved so dearly, the kisses of contemplation must yield to the breasts of preaching and of service; not for our own good must we live, but for the good of all.

Bernard thus, no less than Francis, though in a different mode, felt called to secular activity, and to it he called others. *Nolle proficere, deficere est*, has been suggested for his motto[2]; of which the variant might be added, *Praesis, ut prosis*. Certainly Bernard had more than his share of activity and responsibility. Apart from the influence he wielded through the large number of monks from Clairvaux who held sees throughout Europe, including Henry Murdac at York and two bishops in Ireland, he declined three

2 cf. H. Fechner, *Die politischen Theorien des Abtes Bernhard von Clairvaux in seinen Briefen*, Bonn 1933, p. 85. Mottoes do not lend themselves to translation, but the Latin may be paraphrased "Not to be wanting to help is to be wanting" and "Be at hand, to be handy".

bishoprics himself. To his former pupil, Eugenius, now Bishop of Rome, he wrote that men were saying that Bernard, not Eugenius, was Pope. His power in moulding the order of the Knights Templar, for whom he was long supposed to have written their Rule, was only less than his power in moulding the Cistercian order. Most striking of all, he was actually elected commander-in-chief of the Second Crusade.

Notwithstanding all this, Bernard has hard words for those who take to activity too easily and too soon. In the Church of his day, he remarks, there are too many canals and not enough reservoirs. A reservoir knows that its supplies depend upon its source, nor does it overflow until its banks are full; but our leaders today are eager to give out before they have received, to govern others when they have not yet learned self-discipline. And self-discipline needs learning. Bernard never pretends that it is an easy task, he knows from his own experience that it is not. He also insists that a prior condition of self-discipline is self-knowledge. In his opinion, indeed, knowledge of the soul should come first in all learning. Consequently the faults of youthful priests cause him no surprise; they have yet to understand themselves.

Wherein, then, lies the means of obtaining this self-knowledge which is requisite? The answer is interesting, and the more revealing in that it comes in a casual adverbial phrase. It is through humility that man comes most truly to understand his own worthlessness. On the all-importance in religion of humility Bernard never wavers. The humility, which, expressing itself in love, brought him forth in the service of others, he describes explicitly as the foundation of the whole spiritual fabric. In the Virgin Mary, to whom, as a good Cistercian, he was passionately devoted, he rates her humility above her virginity; without her humility her virginity would not have sufficed, nor would the Holy Ghost have rested on her. Seek ye first humility, and all these things shall be added unto you: Bernard says this in almost so many words.

If we turn to consider his attitude to scholasticism, we find that it is controlled by these two factors, his experience of sweet intercourse with God and the humility which is at once the cause and the result of that intercourse. His own discovery of God was not along the paths of reason. Of course he is aware of the place reason must have in life. He can ask a boon because it seems reasonable; he can wish to do a thing since reason demands it; and when he wrote against the dogma of the Immaculate Conception, he gave the ground that reason was against it. But there is all the difference between reason (*ratio*) and reasoning (*ratiocinatio*); and in the latter sphere he was fully aware that disingenuous arguments can depend on impure motives.

Down Reason then, at least vain reasonings down!

But more. Even Plato and Aristotle and the study of them he could deprecate,

> Though Reason here aver
> That moral verdict quits her of unclean.

The explanation is that Bernard felt, as Dante was to feel, that after the sharp conclusion to which one is brought by the power of the Holy Spirit every logical demonstration must be dull (*ottusa*). Nor should such an attitude be dismissed as obscurantist. To obscurantism it may lead; but so may scholastic reasoning lead to aridity and barrenness. Bernard's position finds sympathetic reflection in his contemporary Walter Daniel's description of Aelred, the Abbot of Rievaulx. After observing that words may lack sense and be no better than dogs barking Walter praises Aelred for putting the rules of grammar in their place and for despising the vain study of worldly eloquence, out of a love for truth pure and undefiled.

Bernard's antagonism to Abelard was thus in part because Abelard impersonated, as it were, the whole forces of *ratiocinatio* in religion. The outcome of Abelard's teaching, moreover, was as objectionable to Bernard as his approach. To Bernard, as a mystic, the truths of religion, apart from whatever certainty they possessed through being supernaturally revealed, were as indubitably certain as the truths of experience generally. Mystical contemplation he defines as an apprehension of the truth which is certain and leaves no doubt. This is, indeed, the certitude of intuition rather than the certainty of reason—we recall the identification of belief with discovery—a distinction which the poverty of abstract nouns in Latin did not help Bernard to see clearly; but it is certitude. Inevitably, therefore, and not simply as the guardian of orthodoxy, Bernard was bound to condemn Abelard, when Abelard defined faith as opinion. "I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded (*certus sum*)", Bernard quotes, very justly retorting that opinions are the issue of dons' minds, whose province it is to doubt everything and be sure of nothing.

Such language as Abelard's further revealed a lack of that humility which for Bernard was essential. Abelard was outstepping himself and through the wisdom of words forsaking the Cross. Bernard realized (to use Hooker's phrase) that it were dangerous for the feeble brain of man to wade far into the doings of the Most High; grace, not language, must be the teacher here, and for the present his philosophy would be to know Jesus and Him crucified. Obscurantist this might be, but he was decided. Unless it were in the name of Jesus, he would be party to no discussion.

In the aesthetic sphere Bernard's attitude is of a piece with this. Without an appreciation of natural beauty he certainly was not.

His power of detachment, it is true, was so great that, like Calvin, he could pass by the Lake of Geneva without so much as observing it; but there seems no reason to regard as insincere his advice to Henry Murdac that he would find more in the woods than in books, that nature could teach him what might not be learned from his masters. Besides this, there are his many references to flowers: Nazareth he interprets as a flower, the Virgin is a sweetly smelling flower, so is the Virgin's Son, a flower white and ruddy. It was over the place of beauty in religion that controversy arose, especially with the Cluniac order, and here Bernard simply adopts the timeless Puritan position. Some will defend the Cluniac monks as thinking that they could not do too much in using the beauty of art to help them in giving glory to God. That is all very well, but it represents an ideal, and Bernard asks just how the immodest monkeys and monstrous centaurs, which adorned the great Cluniac churches, were to give glory to God. He lays down the Puritan condemnation that these things are a distraction rather than an aid to worship. What is their purpose? he asks; to bring sinners to repentance or to be admired? Beauty is not the same as the numinous, nor is the bringing of a gift to be identified with prayer. Such luxury of externality, an expression, like contemporary scholasticism, of a flowering humanism, was far removed from the simple, austere inner life of religion which Bernard knew. He further condemned it for the wealth it required and the expense it involved. In Catholic, as in Protestant, Puritanism it is possible for the artistic approach to be eclipsed by a utilitarian motive as well as by one more truly devotional; but poverty, simplicity, was an especial ideal with the Cistercians, and it is natural that Bernard should appeal to it as a criterion for the true worship of God no less than for His service in the world.

Here Bernard sharply distinguishes between the regular and the secular priest, between the monk and the bishop. Of the wine Paul counselled Timothy to drink, he quaintly remarks that it was intended for a bishop, not a monk, and he reproaches the monks of Cluny for aping episcopal habits. One might therefore expect that he would deprecate the leaving their monastery by his own monks, in order to become bishops. Yet after 1120, when a precedent was made by the elevation of Peter of Clairvaux to the archbishopric of Tarentaise, the number of sees which were filled by monks from Clairvaux continually increased, in each case enlarging the sphere of Bernard's influence throughout Europe. A solution of the apparent contradiction may be found in the emphasis Bernard lays on poverty. This it is which characterizes, or should characterize, the monk; and if the monk will retain it as a bishop, the episcopate can only be strengthened. Others might

advance the common-sense objection to the monk-bishop expressed later by Henry III of England, that the cloister could hardly provide him with much experience in secular activity, but such an appeal to expediency would weigh little against Bernard's other-worldliness. That Master Gilbert should become a bishop is no matter for surprise, he wrote in congratulation to Gilbert the Universal, but that a bishop of London should live in poverty is magnificent. This poverty, of which Bernard makes so much, is, we may see, but the outward expression of the humility which he counted essential. As he says in so many words, it is not poverty which is a virtue but the love of poverty. Blessed are the poor, not in goods, but in spirit.

In this ecclesiastical sphere, no less than in the aesthetic and the academic, Bernard thus strove after an ideal of humility which proceeded directly from the self-knowledge given in his mystical experience of the love of God. He had the faults of other great idealists. He tended on occasion to identify his ideal with himself, as perhaps in parts of the controversy with Abelard or when he commanded the English king to assist the monks who were coming to found the first Cistercian house in this country as if they were the messengers of Almighty God. He was also so passionately devoted to his ideal that he could disregard the sacrifice of human personality to it. The good of the Church must come before people, and his abuse of Abelard may in this way best be explained, though not excused. Bernard had his faults, but it was a noble ideal which he pursued; and he succeeded in being, to use his own image, a reservoir of the prevenient love of God, a reservoir calm and deep, humbly dependent upon his source, overflowing with the simplicity, yet with the unrestrainable power, of a mountain brook, fertilizing and refreshing, till, by the way of loving service, a return was made to the ocean whence in the beginning his waters came, *illi pelago aeterni luminis et luminosae aeternitatis.*

RELIGIOUS BELIEF AND MODERN DEMANDS

By John E. Owen, M.A., Ph.D.

Sociologist, United States Air Force, Visiting Professor of Sociology, University of Helsinki, 1951-52.

Some devout adherents of organized religion are indifferent, if not hostile, to the newer sciences of psychology, anthropology and sociology. Yet it might be rewarding to the friends of religion to examine these other approaches to human experience. Indeed, should any source of knowledge and insight be excluded, any new avenue be ignored, in the search for religious truth?

There is manifestly much subtle and indirect opposition to submitting religious beliefs to the view of modern social science. The fears of an older generation that the effects of university experience may cause the young to 'lose their faith' are but one example of this tendency to shut out new knowledge. Yet if a religious faith cannot stand up to the clear light of impartial inquiry, is it a faith worth having in the first instance? In religion man finds security, and the need for security is deep-seated in the human psyche, yet should security be based upon illusory foundations, or upon outlooks and concepts to which one has become emotionally attached on account of the security-feeling they evoke? It is well known that dogmatism, in religion or elsewhere, is frequently a shield and a cover for an underlying uncertainty regarding the truth of doctrines which may be vehemently espoused but whose validity is uncomfortably suspect. When this spirit reveals itself in theological realms, does it represent authentic security on the part of the believer, or is it merely grounded, in greater or lesser degree, upon ignorance of the believer's own compulsions and psychological needs?

It is perhaps too much to expect that the average individual be sufficiently enlightened as to be able to analyse his own emotional needs and urges in their religious expression and in terms of modern psychological and sociological insights. But is this too much to hope for from his religious leaders? If organized religion loses ground, as it appears in many ways to be doing before the impact of new knowledge, will this not in some measure be the fault of those religious leaders who, instead of welcoming this new knowledge, ignore or attack it? For despite the current widespread interest in religion that is reported by many university centres, there is manifested today on both sides of the Atlantic an outright rejection of religious orthodoxy by many intellectuals. The

phenomenon of the educated intellectual with no active church-connection is so well known as to need no comment. But if an explanation be called for, it would appear that orthodoxy can no longer be fitted into his new definition of the world, into his emancipated value-system. And inquiry would probably reveal that the new interest in religion among university students is not an interest in orthodoxy *per se*. It represents rather a return to the fundamental questions that men have always asked, but it remains to be seen whether the modern generation will long be satisfied, if at all, with the answers that have traditionally been given.

For the old answers, in the way that theological orthodoxy has formulated them, cannot easily be reconciled with the 'acids of modernity.' These answers fail to satisfy, largely because the modern mind has rejected the assumptions on which they are based. A friendly but impartial observer would have to admit that certain aspects of present-day religion involve what the sociologist would term 'cultural lag,' or a failure on the part of this element of modern culture to keep abreast of contemporary thought-patterns. In religion this failure consists, in part, in an inability to re-define its conceptions and to reconcile itself with the new knowledge presented by the natural and social sciences. And this problem involves the fact that many representatives of religion see no compelling need to recognize the claims of modern knowledge. They still tend to accept the old definitions of the human situation and naturally assume that the ideological framework within which their religious philosophy operates is valid and adequate for present-day needs.

Hegel reminded us that when a civilization begins to speculate about itself it is on the decline, and as the Dean of St. Paul's has noted, modern man may be pertinently compared with a hypochondriac who is forever taking his own temperature, for no type of contemporary literature is more popular among thoughtful persons than that which would tell them where they stand and where they are going[1]. And the late Karl Mannheim has brilliantly affirmed that we are now passing through a crisis-situation in human culture in which established value-systems are being disintegrated and gradually replaced by new values[2].

One of the distinguished thinkers of India likewise avers that "the generation that is passing built its traditions and institutions on the values of freedom and sense of responsibility of the individual on the one hand, and the efficiency and power of industrial organization and ambition for empire and world domination in the organized state-society on the other. The new generation is inclined

[1]W. R. Matthews, *Essays in Construction*, 1934.
[2]Karl Mannheim, *Man and Society in an Age of Reconstruction*, 1940.

to build on the basis of the values of personal association, social security, and equality in the sharing of great values. It is also groping after total and human (world) values into which regional and national values may be integrated, an ethical system that is universal for mankind, and that achieves order and solidarity on a global basis by world-wide institutions and practices.''[8]

If such a transformation is actually taking place, and the foregoing and other diagnoses would certainly suggest that it is, then the sooner the religious implications of this evolution of values are recognized, the better. For a faith that does not inquire, that is not alert to the latest advances on man's sociological and intellectual frontiers and to the human situation as it exists, will not long survive. If, as some present-day thinkers claim, much in traditional religion is either an illusion or an irrelevance, then it is the task of the religious mind to seek a re-definition and re-interpretation of the faith that will be neither illusory nor irrelevant. Only such a clear-sighted faith can endure and meet the needs of the modern world. Indeed, does any faith deserve to endure if it cannot relate itself to those needs?

The truth that makes men free is a many-sided truth, to be found in varied sources. It is absurd to assume that any one approach to experience has any monopoly of truth. Yet in recent decades there is one outlook, that of natural science, that has taken the field in vast areas of thought. Science, it is held, contains the sole key to truth. The very word, scientific, has become a fetish with thousands, and although self-determination in the world of the mind cannot be any more justifiably absolute than in the world of politics, many would make the naïve claim that only the sciences can give valid knowledge. It is not necessary to dwell upon the philosophical shortcomings of this viewpoint. But it is significant that the attempt to live by scientific facts alone has left a moral and spiritual void in modern man, a void fraught with untold dangers, among them the danger of falling for false gods, as recent German experience plainly reveals. Religion must fill this void, but what kind of a faith will it be that is adequate to the demands of the contemporary situation?

A first requirement would be that the modern faith be intellectually respectable. It is thirty years since Sir Henry Jones gave his Gifford Lectures under the title, *A Faith that Inquires*. Since that time the humanistic sciences of semantics, psychology, sociology and anthropology have advanced in several interesting directions and have asked many new questions. But how many Christians are aware of these questions? How many believers have an enlightened faith, or would be able to give a respectable statement

[8]Radhakamal Mukerjee, *The Social Structure of Values*, 1950, p. 7.

of their own religious philosophy? Is it not a truism that all too many individuals continue to employ theological phrases without thinking of their meaning? The new science of semantics has been seldom applied to religious terminology and concepts. We have seldom asked ourselves what empirical validity inheres in theological concepts and beliefs. Are they actually rooted in man's experience, or are they merely part of a culturally-acquired system of thought that has come down to us from past epochs and is currently believed in for the main reason that most adherents were born into that particular system. The question of why men believe what they believe, in all of its psychological and historical ramifications, is one that needs to be analysed anew.

Even the logical positivists, paradoxically, can be of service to Christianity by their insistence upon the clearer definition of terms used in religious language. Not that the religious mind is likely to accept the principle of logical positivism that sees no reality beyond sense-experience. The religious conception of 'experience' is much broader, and very rightly so. Yet positivist claims should act as a stimulus upon Christian thinkers to examine anew their own epistemological assumptions and to affirm the more meaningful doctrine of man and his destiny that their faith embraces.

Some devout believers would doubtless resent any attempt to inquire into the meaning or validity of religious faith and experience. Their beliefs, they would maintain, are self-evident and sacred. One may respect the sincerity involved in this claim, yet there is little ground for the view that it is in any way sacrilegious to inquire into the philosophical and psychological foundations of belief. The on-coming generation, and especially the university-trained, will demand 'a faith that inquires.'

The new areas of inquiry are as yet in their infancy, yet they already have raised issues that demand answering. One pertinent example, likely to become more significant with the rising prestige of social science, involves the sociological study of comparative cultures and the consequent claim that moral principles are merely social rules, lacking objective validity. This view is unfounded, as moral philosophers are well aware, but it has become part of the contemporary climate of opinion. Another question on the borderline of psychology and sociology is that of whether secular humanism does not involve the implicit expression of a collective social ego, of humanity's pride in itself, and the sanctioning of a cultural value-system. Psychology and sociology can enable men to look with a more objective vision at such questions and to analyse human emotions and urges and their institutionalized religious expression. This is a dangerous, yet necessary, task.

The study of religious origins afforded by anthropology does

not establish, or destroy, the validity of religious beliefs or practices. But it does make for a deeper understanding and insight, and can lead to a more critical examination of the underlying meanings and cultural foundations of belief, an examination that many Christians have often failed to pursue, on the mistaken view that to think analytically regarding their faith is to be disloyal to it.

The critical mind learns to distinguish between the poetry of faith, the symbols of religion, the collective representations that Durkheim spoke of,[4] and the reality that these portray. But has there not been perhaps an over-concentration on the poetry and the symbols of religion, verbal and other, with a consequent neglect at times of the deeper realities that underlie them?

One of the sociological criteria of religion concerns its effects upon group life and interaction. Does the faith merely sanction the customary and so resist constructive change, or does it make for the inculcation of as yet unrealized social ideals and the creative integration of human personality?

The psychology and sociology of religion are subsidiary to religious philosophy and its concern with the place of religion in human experience and the ultimate validity of religious conceptions. It is now widely recognized in thoughtful circles that religion must be tested by the same logical tests that are applied to other areas of experience. The knowledge-problem, however, has largely been ignored by all too many believers. The man in the pew too frequently fails to distinguish between logical certainty and his own need for psychological certainty. Yet the conviction with which a belief is held has no direct bearing upon the validity of the belief itself. The mere re-affirmation of a belief or article of faith does nothing to establish its philosophical foundations, and religious convictions are not infrequently in danger of being supported by little more than self-authenticating intuitions. These observations apply more particularly to those groups in which the fervour of religious emotion is more in evidence than the critical faculty. Yet Christians in general need to become more enlightened regarding their faith and their own psychological and philosophical reasons for its affirmation.

But faith is not solely an affair of the intellect. Religion is patently concerned with the motives and intentions and with the moral judgments that men make, not as creatures of reason alone but as living beings of feeling, emotion, and will. Is it not in the moral arena above all that more enlightenment is called for today? A faith that can meet the demands of the dilemma of contemporary culture will have to be one that is grounded in ethical insight, in clear moral vision. Indeed, is this not essential to the foundation

4E. Durkheim, *The Elementary Forms of the Religious Life*, 1915

of all high religion? For high religion is concerned with the supreme moral and spiritual values, and probably the greatest need of the present, as always, is the inculcation of a keener degree of moral insight on the part of ever-widening sections of mankind.

Yet though Schleiermacher spoke of 'mere ethics,' Protestantism has appeared to act upon the doubtful premise that a sincere avowal of Christian faith would automatically imply a higher degree of moral insight and the consequent practice of an ethical life. Involved in this view is the equally dubious assumption that most individuals and groups ordinarily know the right course of action to take even in the most complex moral situations and hence religion simply exists to give them the dynamic emotional fervour to implement and carry out their 'Christian' intentions. But experience would hardly warrant the thesis that Christian believers manifest appreciably more ethical insight than honest sceptics or humanists outside the realms of theological orthodoxy. In fact, far from giving more moral vision to its adherents, conventional religion may easily have the opposite effect of confirming their prejudices. Instead of enabling them to see through the rationalisations by which men justify their egoistic impulses, it may itself provide the main justification for these impulses. As Reinhold Niebuhr has pointed out, every age has its characteristic hypocrisies by which it seeks to justify its egoistic urges.[5] Although our contemporary moral justifications appear to have a superior plausibility about them, we face a crisis resulting from lack of consensus regarding values and from the different levels of ethical sensitivity in various segments of mankind. Our own ability to penetrate through the rationalizations of other past eras (for example, the social Darwinism of the nineteenth century) does not necessarily open our eyes to similar questionable aspects of moral wisdom that our own age embodies.

Religion and morality are intertwined variables, but the quality of any faith depends in large measure upon the degree of moral insight that it embraces. Morality, in a wide sense, may be regarded as the empirical element in religion, in that it is moral values that relate faith to the pressing problems of man's life. One main function of religion is to point to and exemplify the intrinsic worth of moral values in human experience. It is ethical insight that distinguishes a high faith from the type that merely sanctions the customary standards of social expectation and action. In certain historical epochs great moral leaders stand out as men who revealed a keen sense of moral insight by which the then current faith became ennobled and purified.[6] Thus in the pre-Christian period Socrates

[5]Reinhold Niebuhr, *Reflections on the End of an Era*, 1932.
[6]See L. T. Hobhouse, *Morals in Evolution* (new edition, 1951).

and Plato, and in more recent times Kant and the nineteenth-century humanitarians, were among those who attempted to search for and apply high ethical perception to human experience. On a moral view the deity is a Being of righteousness, and it is an evolution in essentially ethical conceptions that marks the rise of religion from its early associations with superstition and barbarism to the moral genius of the Old Testament prophets, culminating in the teachings of Jesus, who showed that high moral vision is the first step towards individual and social redemption.

Historical Christianity has made little attempt at a critical examination of moral experience, largely on account of the mistaken assumptions previously noted. But problems of morality, broadly conceived, are the most urgent of modern life, and a faith which is adequate for twentieth-century society will have to speak and act with a clarity of Christian ethical awareness that has not hitherto been noticeable in the conflicts of loyalties involved in economic arrangements, race relations and international tensions. The failure to penetrate to the ultimate ethical implications of faith has been tragically widespread in its consequences. Far too frequently western Christianity has appeared to acquiesce with an apparently easy conscience in rampant social injustice, and to accept the moral presuppositions of the surrounding culture, conserving the values already reached by society in its upward evolution, rather than making effectual efforts to enhance or elevate those values. The charge against religious orthodoxy concerning its helplessness and irrelevance in the present social scene would be robbed of much of its cogency if the representatives of the faith were to exemplify the moral vision that made Christianity so powerful a force in earlier epochs, and if Christian thinkers were more aggressive in counteracting the modern scientific concept of man as a creature identical with the rest of nature.

Christians themselves sometimes make the plea that they are at present caught in a transition period of history, an era when the power of the mind and the fruits of the spirit appear impotent against the onrush of historical-political events and the forces of scientific materialism. But to concede that the creative force of the spirit is a mere pawn of other forces is to admit, in effect, the validity of the Marxist view of man and history.

A faith fit for the needs of the future will have to keep abreast of the best knowledge of the present, without sacrificing the valid insights of the past. To command the allegiance of the ethically enlightened, it will have to embody a level of moral wisdom that transcends contemporary standards. For upon the moral judgments that men make, the quality of their religion and the future of their civilization, depend.

JESUS AND THE KINGDOM OF GOD

By McEwan Lawson, M.A., B.D.

If a hundred people were asked what they think the Kingdom of God means, some astonishing answers would be gathered. Some would say it means the ultimate triumph of the particular political party they favour. Others would outline what Professor T. W. Manson calls a "glorified garden suburb." Some would answer that, as we labour feverishly like coral insects, a true social order will, at last, rise above the waves of human ignorance and greed. Others would describe the Kingdom of God as a heavenly court above the skies filled with singing angels and only to be reached after death or at the ending of this evil world. In the main, the emphasis would be on human effort and slow evolution, and the coming of the Kingdom would be set far over the horizon. And all this is as different from what Jesus taught as a November fog is from a bright June morning.

For centuries before Christ's time the Hebrews had believed in God as an invisible, but always active, King. A Greek thinker might picture the Divine as an impersonal ideal enthroned above the skies, but, to the Hebrew, God was constantly leaving His throne to do things. He comes down to break Egyptian prison chains. He makes a covenant with His people and promises to be their Keeper, Guide, King and Father. He gives them laws for a right way of life, by which they can live under His care and receive His power. The Hebrews believed that, for a time, there had actually been a prosperous Kingdom of God on earth under David and Solomon as God's vice-regents. But, even when the chariots of invading enemies thundered down, the faithful in Israel still held that God, their King, was above the darkness. Then, as crude conceptions of God's character were shed, and men began to think of God as just, holy and full of compassion, the standards of obedience heightened. So, although some might be greedy, careless and forgetful of their God, there were always those who tried to keep near to God, to live under His rule and form part of His Kingdom. Away back in 740 B.C., Isaiah saw the terror of Assyria swinging down on an Israel which had neither trusted nor obeyed God. But, in the symbolism which Orientals love, he yet called his son by the extraordinary name of Shear-Jashub, which meant that a remnant would turn to God and be saved, and he set to work to train such a group of true disciples. Foreign influence grows and the Hebrew king, Manasseh, builds shrines to Astarte

and to the sun god in the sacred Temple, whilst in terror and fear, children are sacrificed on the altars of pagan gods. At Manasseh's death, his successor, King Josiah, attempts an external reformation by commanding all in Jerusalem to promise to obey the sacred Law, and when this fails, a profound thinker like Jeremiah teaches that the rule of God can never come by outward enactments but by a new vision of God's nature, and by His cleansing, incoming power changing the hearts of men. Then, in the dreary Babylonian concentration camps, the writer of the Suffering Servant poems calls Israel, or a group in Israel, to be not only a saved remnant, but a saving company, a brand plucked from the burning to lighten the dark world with the message of God's love and to redeem the nations in the suffering energy of a slave of God. Back in Palestine and under the teaching of Ezekiel, Ezra and Nehemiah, the idea of a holy people, bound in God's service and sanctified by His law, grows, and in their psalm-hymns the word "I" frequently means not an individual, but a dedicated group. During the fearful persecutions under the Syrian king, Antiochus Epiphanes, in 175-164 B.C., the idea of a faithful company grows. In *Daniel,* written at this time to fortify the hunted and the martyred, a band of Hebrew youths refuse to bow before the towering image of a pagan god and are flung into a raging fire of torment, seven times hotter than had ever been known. But, as they stand faithful to the God of their fathers, a rescuing presence comes down to them in the flames. Inspired by this vision, bands of Hebrew men, women and children refused to acknowledge the rule of the Syrian king and were massacred, shouting their allegiance to their invisible King and their sole obedience to His sacred Law.

But, although there was always a conception of God as King, and a growing belief that all pagan gods were not evil rivals but non-existent, and, although a faithful nucleus was believed to constitute the beginning of God's Kingdom, it was tragically clear to all in Christ's time that God was not the ruler of the world. His chosen people were under the heel of Rome and their religion was treated as the fantastic superstition of a ridiculous sect. The explanation for this was a conviction, growing immensely stronger in the two centuries before Jesus, that the world by its ignorance and sin was now imprisoned by Satanic forces. The early Hebrews had always believed in evil spirits; hollows in the desert, ruins and burial places were haunted by hairy demons and fearful night monsters. But, in Persia, the belief had grown that, above these crude demons, there towered vast powers of evil, and that the darkness, confusion and tragedy of life could only be explained because the earth was a battlefield between these evil forces of darkness and the hosts of light. The Hebrews had accepted this

belief, though they never held, as Persia tended to do, that the powers of good and evil were almost equally matched and together divided and dominated the world. For the Hebrews God was all-powerful and could, at any moment He chose, liquidate all evil forces. But, in the meantime, the generally accepted belief was that, just as a street was crammed with jostling people, so the air above was full of demons, and rising above these, were vast spiritual powers of darkness which ruled the world and, using Roman emperors as their slaves, bound Israel in a dungeon of gloom and frustration.

But they also believed, with a suppressed and burning fury, that the God, who had chosen the Hebrews as His children and promised them a Kingdom, would eventually move to their rescue and burst their prison doors. There was no fixed view about the way in which this rescue would come. Some said that God would raise up as His chosen representative a conquering king like David and of the stock of David. Others believed that a supernatural figure, surrounded by hosts of angel warriors, would swoop down from the skies. Scrolls of excited writings appeared (the Book of Daniel is one), all trying to draw back the curtains and foretell the future. A high throne, circled by rainbows, would appear in the skies and, amid flashing lightning and roaring thunder, all men would be judged. Trumpets would sound, the seals of the books of God would be broken, and plague, dragons, fire and terror would swoop upon the reeling world. Some proclaimed that a kingdom would be established on earth with all the nations bowing to Jerusalem as its star-crowned capital. Others foretold that the sorry world would be burned to nothingness and that a glorious Kingdom, without night, pain or tears, would be established beyond the skies. But, always, the Kingdom lay below the horizon and, always, it was to come under the violent hammer blows of Divine Power. So, by Christ's time, all were waiting either patiently, but generally in feverish fanaticism, for the clouds to be torn apart by the hands of God, whilst, to assist Him in the destruction of the evil and the Roman oppressors, many were feeling for daggers and swords.

It was into all these frenzied hopes and tumultuous dreams that Jesus came with a very different message. He taught that God, in His love and grace, was invading the world, that heaven was moving in upon earth, and that the Rule of God was not beyond the horizon but is here and now knocking at the door of every heart and mind. In Plato's *Phaedo*, written more than three hundred and fifty years before the birth of Christ, there is an account of what he suggests the world looks like if seen from above. He says that it is like a ball but, instead of being wrapped about with layers of leather, it is encircled with spheres of being, full of increasing light,

beauty, goodness and truth. These spheres of being are near to us as the air, but most of us are unaware of them because we are prisoned in the earth sphere. This is the lowest sphere of all and in it we move about drearily like fish nosing into mud or weaving their way dreamily through shadowy forests of sea-weed. And, when some wiser, more adventurous fishes come to us, telling that they have swum to the surface of our grey sea and seen mountains and radiant sunshine, and calling us to leave our mud and swim upward to another realm of consciousness, we gaze at them with blank, doubting eyes, hold them as crazed, and again burrow our noses in the mud. But, although Plato's picture may help to lift our earth-bound minds to a clearer geography of the universe and to the new realms of consciousness which Jesus knew and lived in, His message is much more dynamic. Jesus does not tell of an impersonal, waiting, divine majesty, towering in glory above the grey sea of our ignorance. His startling good news is of a Father hurrying out to rescue an imprisoned world. Looking back to history, He says that God, the Father, has been seeking all nations all through the ages. He teaches that there has never been a time when the light of the divine Mind and Love has not been trying to get past the shuttered windows of human ignorance and sin, of doubt and foolish self-sufficiency. The favour, grace, forgiveness and the love of God have been, He teaches, continuously at work. The great Hebrew prophets and teachers have, under God, He tells, sown the divine seed, and secretly it has germinated and grown in human hearts, until now, ripening to the harvest, it waits for the reapers with hands of love. The hidden leaven of God's Kingdom, He says, has been ceaselessly working in the Hebrew race and now the dough swells and bubbles with divine life.

Jesus knew this inflowing divine energy in His own experience. He saw it in the beauty of sunrise and sunset; it pulses in the fields of growing grain and throbs in the songs of the birds; it flows along the stems of plants; it holds the stars and breathes into the hearts of men. Old Testament thought had spoken much of God in terms of stupendous might but, whilst this thought is in Jesus, His emphasis is on the divine care for little things. God, Jesus says, prepares meals for sparrows and dresses flowers with a beauty which leaves a dandified king like Solomon far behind. God, Jesus teaches, cares infinitely for men and women. He sees them fear-haunted, ill in body and mind, fettered by chains of distrust, captured by the dark powers of evil, and now He comes to call them from their dungeons of despair, spiritual poverty, insecurity, dread and sin into the rich halls of a present Kingdom which waits like a spread marriage feast for its guests. Jesus summons men to waken from their prison sleep and see, at their elbow, the open doorway

to a treasure house of rich resources waiting for them. His word is, Come!

And none is shut out. The Kingdom is open to all. Back in Jerusalem after the prison camps of Babylon, with a pagan population and pagan thought seeping in like a tide, the Jewish leaders had built high dykes to preserve their faith. Ezra and Nehemiah taught that the Hebrews were a sacred people settled in a holy land, and their holiness could be preserved only by rigid obedience in every detail to the sacred Hebrew religious law and tradition. All Hebrews who did not keep the Law completely were, therefore, shut out from the holy fold as unclean and leprous sinners. And the same rule applied to foreigners. From quite early times, however, there had been a belief in some Hebrew minds that God's Kingdom would eventually include all nations. In the anguish of captivity, with its consequent increase of compassion for all human suffering, the conviction had grown in some pitying hearts that the Hebrew race was to be the suffering herald of God to all the world. The Suffering Servant poems in Isaiah are a call to the Hebrews not merely to be a saved company but a saving band taking the message of God to all men everywhere, whilst Zechariah tells of a God who "shall speak peace unto the nations and his dominion shall be from sea to sea." But Ezekiel, with the fierceness of a priest terrified by the threat of inrushing pagan floods drowning the sacred Hebrew faith, treats all foreigners as without the pale and, despite the magnificent universalism of the protesting authors of *Ruth* and *Jonah*, sets up high walls and fixed turnstiles of Jewish exclusiveness and narrow nationalistic religion.

But in the Kingdom which Jesus proclaims, all this is swept away. He is immensely concerned with all men, because of their occupation as shepherds or traders, shut out from obeying the Law in every detail. He says it is not the will of God that one of these little ones should perish. God seeks them as a shepherd searches for a lost sheep or a woman brushes all the house to find one coin fallen from her bridal head-dress. And He tells of great rejoicing in heaven when any lost one is found. He describes, in perhaps the greatest story in the world, a Father hurrying out to welcome home a scapegrace son, and contrasts this seeking love of God with the churlish behaviour of the respectable elder brother who represents Jewish orthodoxy. So, whilst the synagogue worshippers and the Jewish clergy spat at the Jew who collected Roman taxes and, when they got the chance, wrecked his collecting booth and half murdered its occupant, Jesus, to the anger of His fellow-countrymen, sought out these outcasts and became their friend. He did the same to the fallen, and stood between the righteous, with stones in their hands, and the prostitute, whom they treated

as dirt and were ready to batter to death. He tells stories of a feast (the current symbol for the Kingdom of God) from which the invited guests excused themselves and which was, instead, filled by dusty tramps from the lanes and outcasts from the slums. And, when some naturally said this was not justice, and that those Hebrews who had served and obeyed God faithfully through the long day of history should receive a higher reward, He told them an astonishing story of a farmer who did not conduct his farm on terms of cold justice but in vast compassion, and paid the hungry unemployed, who came late, with the same generosity as those who had always been in his employment. This for Jesus was a picture of the amazing grace of God and the forgiveness of heaven. In the same way, He was a friend to the foreigner; to the anger of all blazing patriots He showed kindness to the hated Romans and told His followers to do the same. The fact that a man or woman was a despised Samaritan made no difference to His care and sympathy. It is true that Jesus served primarily amongst His own people, and kept, in the main, to His own land, but He did this because He believed that the Hebrews could become the heralds of God to all the world. For Jesus the blessings of the Kingdom were for all men everywhere. The doors of God's love were wide open; turnstiles, such as the national badge of circumcision, were done away; the sunshine of God's forgiveness and the rain of His grace were seeking every room and falling on every field. This Kingdom of God's love is, for Jesus, greater than much in Jewish rule and ritual; it is more than a patch on an old garment, it is new wine which cannot be held in old wine-skins. It is light which must not be hidden under any corn-measure of traditional religion. His disciples are to go out carrying the glad tidings of the Kingdom to all the world.

Jesus also teaches that the quality of our reaction to this invading Kingdom of God's love is of supreme importance for the individual, the nation and the world. He believed, as we have noticed, that the sorrow and tragedy of life come from the fact that men's minds and wills are imprisoned by dark Satanic powers. The Kingdom is a message of immediate rescue and, if we are so foolish as to reject it, the result is that we condemn ourselves to darkness and destruction. There is therefore a note of extreme urgency in the message of Jesus. The Kingdom comes like a bridegroom in the night and, if we are not on the tiptoe of alertness, we find ourselves excluded from the marriage feast. If we do not receive the Kingdom, we are shut into Satan's dungeon. The Kingdom is light and, if we put up our shutters against it, the result is darkness and, in the darkness, there is death. He sees the leaders of His own nation rejecting His message and, as a consequence, He watches the clouds

of Roman destruction gathering over His loved Jerusalem, whilst the Temple, bound in its unchanging ritual and legalism, stands a tumbled ruin because it has closed its doors to the coming of God's redeeming love. Life for Jesus is a battle between the prisoning forces of Satan and the rescuing heralds of divine love and, at the end of the day, the question which each of us will face is a very simple one—What side were you on?

It is because of this that our reaction to the Kingdom is of vital importance, and this is why Jesus, so obviously, loves the man who, with compassion in his heart, acts with initiative and drive. He sees that tragedy sweeps upon the world because so many of us are half-asleep; we dream of what we might do, we wax tepidly sentimental about the world's needs and then, after a moment or two of startled awareness, we fall asleep again. For Jesus the agony of the world comes from the fact that there are so many of us who are drifters, so many who never move into action but merely watch, in hazy confusion of mind like John Bunyan's Mr. Anything. His call is therefore to alertness and immediate decision. He praises the hungry man knocking at the door and demanding bread even though it is midnight; the widow who pesters the judge until she gains her plea; the unjust steward who, seeing threatening danger, plans for his safety; the ploughman who finds treasure in a field and gives all for it; the pearl merchant who throws in all lesser gems to gain one pearl of glowing beauty; the man who counts the cost and then gives up home and friends to follow Jesus in the saving of the world. He tells a story of a careful and fearful servant (the figure represents Jewish legalism) who, fearful of his own skin, preserves his one talent and so loses all. Jesus loves the man who, like John Bunyan, is ready, if need be, to leap off a gallows ladder into the love of God.

Jesus also teaches that we can enter this Kingdom of God's love only by faith. Unfortunately for us the word faith has frequently become linked to the intellectual comprehension (or incomprehension) of a series of complex statements about the being of God, the personality of Jesus, the meaning of the Cross, the nature of the sacraments, or the constitution of the Church. But for the Hebrews and for Jesus the word faith covered something very much more simple. In the main it meant trust in a God who had come to rescue and whose living presence had been experienced on life's journey. In the magnificent eleventh chapter of the letter to the Hebrews there is, for example, a list of the great heroes of the Jewish race who have "kept the faith." Their faith is not an intellectual affirmation to any intricate credal statement but a belief that God is, and that, as they travel and look up to Him in simple childlike (not childish) trust, they find Him utterly reliable. This

comes very near the meaning of the word faith for Jesus. In His own experience He had come to know God as a Father of love, near as light and air. He wanted all to share this same amazing joy. Just as the sun rises, driving back the night, and beats at the closed shutters of our darkened rooms, so Jesus saw the light of God's love streaming down to every heart and seeking to lift men from their shadowed rooms of fear, insecurity, ignorance and sin into the bright country of divine love. He taught that this new realm of consciousness was our true home. It held the air we were meant to breathe, and, in consequence, living in this country, we changed our fear and insecurity into joyous, abounding life. In this new environment the forgiven and fortified spirit receives power to conquer disease and to become a channel through which divine healing can flow to others. John the Baptist sends messengers from his prison to ask Jesus if He is the chosen representative of God come to bring in the Kingdom, and Jesus, for reply, asks the messengers to go back and tell John that the Kingdom has come and is in action—the blind see, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed and the dead live. He sends out seventy disciples, and when they return with glowing accounts of healing of mind and body, Jesus says that this is because they are living in the Kingdom of God and helping it to reach others. Dwelling in this Kingdom of God's love, the dark prison of Satan is left behind, the heart is cleansed, the mind illumined and death cannot touch the soul. We are, in fact, new creatures born from above; and all this life is ours if only we can trust the love of God and, pulling back the curtains, let this new redeeming, creative, divine life stream like sunshine upon us. The painstaking, religious legalists miss this incoming supernatural tide because they are relying on their own strength, but the man or woman who has the simple trust of a child in his Father's love finds the Kingdom.

But there was nothing soft about Jesus, and He never lived in a cloud cuckoo-land of dreams. He called men to a living trust in a God of love, but He also taught that to live in a divine Kingdom there had to be loyalty and obedience to a God of love. This emphasis on obedience to God as King was, of course, no new thing in Hebrew thought. For the Hebrew the protection, guidance, the incoming wisdom, beauty and power of God depended on obedience. Eden is lost and pain is born because man snatches at his desires and rejects God's rule. On Carmel Elijah calls his nation to choose whether they will serve the desert God of their fathers or the unseen lords (the Baals) who were believed to rule in the rich valleys of a new land. Jeremiah tells of how God will fashion new men by putting the divine law in their hearts. The mark of the groups who, through Hebrew history, formed the nucleus of God's

Kingdom was obedience, and the supreme emphasis in later Hebrew religion had always been upon scrupulous loyalty to the Law. Indeed the Rabbis in Christ's time were teaching that, if the Law were perfectly obeyed for a single day, the Kingdom would come. In the Maccabean war groups of faithful Hebrews had been harried into the mountains. The Syrian troops blockaded them in their fortified caves but promised them that, if they would come out and obey the Syrian king's commands, their lives would be spared. This they refused saying that God was their king and they must stand loyal to His Law. So, when the Syrians attacked them on their sacred Sabbath, no sword was drawn, no barricade defended, and thousands of Hebrew men, women and children were massacred in the conviction that they must be ready to die in faithful obedience to their heavenly King and to His law.

This same sense of obedience to God, His Father, runs right through the thought and life of Jesus. He sees Nature living under law; the secret of the poise and beauty of the flowers, for example, is that without any of the self-will and arrogance which disfigure men by cutting them off from God, they give themselves in trust and obedience to the fashioning of the divine. And the same obedience is seen in Jesus Himself. The unique power of His life lies in an intense living experience of God, and this comes from a complete loyalty to God. His watchword is, 'Thy Will be done,' and He calls His disciples to the same obedience. But with Jesus, whilst the personality of God has all the strength of earlier thought, there is a tenderness and a power of self-sacrifice in God which was not a dominant characteristic in earlier conceptions of God. And this divine law of sacrificial redeeming love is higher, and much harder to obey, than the railway time-table legalism of the Jewish code. But this divine love is, for Jesus, of the very nature of God, and to live in the Kingdom you have to live daily in such love.

This obedience to the law of God's love was His message to the world. The Jewish patriots called men to the liberation of Israel by defeating Rome and all other oppressive powers, but Jesus teaches that the supreme warfare is against the hostile spiritual forces of evil which ensnare the human spirit, and that the sword to be used is obedience to the law of love, a sword which in reverse becomes a conquering cross. Popular belief was eager for portents in the skies, heralding a kingdom which would thunder in upon men by divine fiat. But Jesus taught that a new world would be born as individual men and women were reborn by living in the Kingdom of God and by obeying the supreme law of love; when, in fact, God's will is done by divine power working in the human heart on earth as it does in heaven. Therefore Jesus calls his disciples to utter loyalty with Him to God the King. They are soldiers on

active service, and no private interest must be allowed to interfere with a man on campaign. So when a would-be follower asks to be allowed to stay at home and postpone his active discipleship until his aged father has died, Jesus' answer is as peremptory as that of a captain in battle.

Jesus also teaches that the way into the Kingdom is through Him. At the beginning of His ministry, He speaks much of the invading Kingdom of God's love but, as His life goes on, He begins to say more and more clearly that He is the Door. There is no pride in this statement such as appears, for example, in Mohammed proclaiming himself to be God's mouthpiece. Jesus remains incredibly humble in spirit but He knows Himself held in God and sent by God to bring men to the discovery of a new life in the divine love. He calls men to be His friends, to be loyal to Him, to follow in His steps, to listen to His words. There is no yielding of Himself to any form of the power-lust which appears so frequently in human leadership. He tells that all He is comes from God; He seeks the Father's will daily in prayer and, just because of this, He calls men to stand near to Him, to obey His commands, and to find the Father as they hold His hand. But, as His life advances, a deeper note is heard. At the commencement of His ministry, He hoped that the Hebrew religious leaders would accept His message and lead Israel to be the world herald of God's love and rule. Instead, they moved from ridicule to fear. They first threatened and then hunted Him. Herod, too, after executing John the Baptist not only as a fearless critic of the throne but as a dangerous political fire-brand, was ready to do the same to Jesus. With opposition growing in menace, Jesus then concentrates upon teaching His disciple-band and welding His circle of friends into the faithful group who, living in God's love, will bring the Kingdom to the world. Then, to their mystification and distress, He turns more and more to the Suffering Servant poems in Isaiah. He tells them stories about wicked husbandmen who rule a vineyard, ill-treat the owner's messengers and finally kill his son. He begins to speak of an incredible Messiah who, instead of conquering his enemies by violence, will defeat sin and Satan and rule the world from a cross of love. He says that, if He is crucified, the Kingdom of God will come with power. The Cross is the key which opens wide the way into the Kingdom. And, to the consternation of His simple disciples who expected to sit on thrones of power and judgment, He says that they too must know trials and scourgings, share in the fellowship of the Cross and bring in the Kingdom by joining themselves to the redeeming energy of God which they see in Him. The sons of Zebedee ask for thrones and He tells them of suffering, of a baptism in blood, and at the Last Supper He hands them a cup

speaking of His blood poured out and says that they must drink it too. The Kingdom is there spread like a banquet but its rule is complete self-forgetfulness in divine compassion for the world, its doorway is through Him and the shape of this doorway is a Cross.

The difficult problem of how the early Christians came to believe so firmly in a second coming and a final consummation of the Kingdom by divine fiat raises other issues. The question has produced sharp divisions in Christian thought. Some have said that Jesus teaches that the Kingdom will come by steady moral growth just as leaven works in dough. Others have argued that Jesus believed there would be a catastrophic invasion of God and that the Kingdom would rush in upon us as lightning flashes from the sky. But most modern scholarship is coming to see that this 'either/or' attitude of mind and this 'leaven or lightning' dilemma rises from a failure in ourselves and in many of His early followers to understand the basic thought of Jesus. For Jesus, as for the Hebrews, the Kingdom of God is an eternal fact. For Jesus God has always been King and, as He looks back on Hebrew history, He sees God's Kingdom growing. He comes proclaiming that God is moving in on earth, that His Kingdom is seeking every heart as the sun seeks every room. His supreme message, as we have noticed, is that the Kingdom is here and that He is the herald and door. It is equally clear that He believed that the Kingdom will be consummated and completed. But here comes the difference between Jesus and much of the thought of His time. The Jews believed that the Kingdom would be brought in by divine power subduing men and would crush its way in like a divine juggernaut car. And this thought is, of course, quite foreign to the whole message of Jesus both about the nature of God and the way God works. Jesus teaches that God does not use violence, nor storm the citadel of human personality like a giant with a swinging club. On the contrary, He says that God seeks us like light and as patient suffering love, and that the Kingdom will be consummated and completed as men give themselves in trust and obedience to this seeking love of God which they have seen in Him. The thought of Christ's time and since has spoken much of the destruction of the world and has often tried to dress Jesus in its mental robes, but Jesus taught of a world transformed and transfigured because men had, at last, opened the doors of their hearts and minds to the light and power of the incoming Kingdom of God's love.

IS THEOLOGY A NORMATIVE SCIENCE?

By N. H. G. Robinson, D.Litt.

There is, of course, a sense in which an affirmative answer to that question is almost axiomatic; so that few perhaps would be prepared to dispute the contention. Thus it is clear that just as ethics is concerned with the norms or standards of human behaviour, so theology is concerned, not simply with God in the abstract, but with His revelation of Himself, above all with Jesus Christ in whom God's Word was made flesh, and, therefore, with the norm of Christian belief and Christian thought regarding God. Indeed the parallel between ethics and theology in this matter is by no means accidental, for the revelation of God carries with it its own imperative, challenging the conscience and summoning the human person to salvation. "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent."

If, however, these facts entitle us to regard both ethics and theology as normative sciences, it is important that we make quite clear to ourselves what is properly to be meant by that description and in what way precisely a science is normative. In particular, it is of the first importance that we make up our minds between two quite different propositions, that a normative science is one which studies norms that are and would be recognized apart from their systematic examination in this science, and, secondly, that a normative science provides and produces norms which would not be recognized apart from the existence of the science itself. Manifestly, these two contentions are by no means the same and, in fact, they cannot both apply in respect of the same part or aspect of a single science, although of course it is not inconceivable that the same science in different parts should be normative in the one sense and normative in the other. The findings of a given science concerning certain norms with which it deals may themselves be made normative, but that is clearly a further step in addition to the consideration of the norms with which it began, and it is questionable whether it really belongs to the science as such.

Ethics is perhaps the normative science *par excellence,* and it is not difficult to discover in which of the two senses it is so, for, clearly, the function and aim of ethics are to study moral standards, and not to produce or manufacture them; and the moralist has no source of insight into what is required of human beings in their

behaviour which is denied to other men who are not moralists. The moralist may perhaps be able to think more clearly and acutely than they, but what he thinks about is the standard or standards of morality which he and they as ordinary men recognize independently of moral science. The study of ethics may indeed have certain practical effects in the realm of the ordinary moral consciousness. It may reveal unsuspected confusion and contradiction, but having revealed contradiction it is powerless to resolve it. On that point the appeal is to conscience itself, with which the moralist as such is not specially endowed.

In the same way the norm in Christian theology is Christ. He is the norm of all professedly Christian thought about God and His purpose of salvation, and neither theology nor any other human science can usurp Christ's place. Theology may certainly disclose unsuspected confusion and contradiction in the realm of ordinary faith and belief, but having placed its question-mark and indicated the matters which are obscure or in conflict it can do nothing more to remove the difficulty. Theology, that is to say, is concerned with a norm or standard of Christian thought and belief, but it does not and cannot produce a norm any more than ethics of itself can provide a rule of conduct.

It is then a curious and interesting fact that the claim is sometimes advanced on behalf of theology, or on behalf of one part of theology, dogmatics, that it is a normative science in the other sense of the phrase, that it does not simply concern itself with norms of thought and life, but that it provides such norms. This no doubt is a surprising claim for any science to make, and yet it is quite clear that Dr. Karl Barth does make it and, moreover, makes it as a central part of his whole dogmatic system. "Over against and alongside of the Church's proclamation there must go a Church theology, especially dogmatics. Theology, and dogmatics in particular, is, in contradistinction to all scattered answers to immaterial questions, the Church's concentrated anxiety and concern about her most intimate responsibility. In making her proclamation the raw material of dogmatics, she is doing, apart from the proclamation itself and the prayer that it may be right, the one thing that she badly needs, the only thing she as the Church can do about the obvious centre of her life."[1] "The datum from which dogmatics starts is neither God, nor revelation, nor faith. This is the datum from which proclamation starts . . . ."[2] The datum from which dogmatics starts is "a different one, namely the debatable fact that in proclamation by men there is human language about God, revelation, faith . . . ."[3] Dogmatics is thus concerned only indirectly with revelation, God and faith, and is directly con-

[1] *The Doctrine of the Word of God*, p. 84. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 91. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 92.

cerned with the Church's proclamation. "It tests the 'orthodoxy' of contemporary kerygma."[4] "In being an exposition, it is also an investigation and a polemic, a criticism and a revision."[5] "Even concrete dogma is nothing but kerygma tested, provisionally purified, and reduced to a definite 'correct' formula by the Church."[6]

There is of course another side to all this in Dr. Barth's teaching. Even dogmatic results "are invariably results of human effort."[7] Whether in her dogmatic activity the Church "is acting as the Church and so is discerning God in faith, whether the result of her action is therefore just and weighty criticism or revision, and not a worse devastation of Christian language, does not lie within her province. Obviously the givenness of the special and decisive conditions of dogmatics, the decision from time to time of what is or is not the truth in dogmatics, are matters of divine predestination."[8] "Upon her human work she can, once more, only do a human work of criticism and revision."[9] And yet this does not cancel out the other side. Is it then that in her dogmatic activity the Church may not hit upon truth, but that she does hit upon what the Church takes to be truth and what is therefore orthodoxy or correctness?

This would be clear enough but the difficulties arise when it is remembered that Dr. Barth entitles his work *Church Dogmatics*. That, presumably, is to be taken as an indication of the subject, the field he proposes to cover, and not of any ecclesiastical authority enjoyed by the author. Dr. Barth's results are the results of an individual theologian's thought and are doubtless offered only as such. If that is so, it becomes a problem to see how they can be regarded as a criticism and revision, as a norm of Christian preaching. It is this claim which accounts, at least in part, for the accusation of arrogance that is sometimes made against Dr. Barth's theology, and it is important to try to trace it to its ultimate source in the system of his thought. What is it then that leads Dr. Barth to describe dogmatic theology, which is, after all, in a finished form, only the dogmatics of this theologian or of that, as none the less a norm, a criticism and revision of Christian preaching?

It is not of course that Dr. Barth himself, or those who accept his views, believe that in his theology he has given us final truth, or that his theological thinking is marked by infallibility; nor, on the other hand, is it the case that Dr. Barth and his followers claim to be in a position to define orthodoxy and correctness of belief for others—only the Church herself can do that for her members and she can only do so in duly constituted council or assembly. What

[4] *The Doctrine of the Word of God*, p. 92.
[5] *Ibid.*, p. 92.
[6] *Ibid.*, p. 92.
[7] *Ibid.*, p. 14.
[8] *Ibid.*, pp. 22f.
[9] *Ibid.*, p. 84.

then is it that Dr. Barth does which explains his account of dogmatics as the criticism and revision of preaching? It can only be, I think—although Dr. Barth himself would not agree—that he puts himself in the place of the Church and attempts to say what she *ought* to declare as her belief and the test of her preaching. This is, one must allow, a perfectly permissible and proper procedure which recognizes that "theology . . . . is in contradistinction to all scattered answers to immaterial questions"[10], and that it arises out of the appropriate work of the Church; but it is questionable whether this perfectly proper procedure really justifies Dr. Barth's description of dogmatics as concerned with the criticism and revision of preaching, and his contention that the datum from which dogmatics starts is not God, revelation, faith, but rather "the debatable fact that in proclamation by men there is human language about God, revelation, faith."[11] In fact it seems perfectly clear that it does not. It is certainly true that theology is not simply a matter of idle speculation in which the theologian indulges because he happens to like that sort of thing. On the contrary, it is bound up with the life of the Church, is closely connected with "her most intimate responsibility," and is indeed pursued in response to Christ's own commandment to go out into all the world and preach the Gospel. This does not mean, however, that theology is directly concerned with the Church's proclamation as its subject-matter and that it offers a criticism and revision thereof. Rather it suggests that theology itself *is* proclamation, that its subject-matter is not proclamation but God, revelation and faith (the subject-matter of proclamation too), and that this proclamation takes its place, not above but alongside the *ad hoc* proclamation of the weekly sermon, as *systematic* proclamation. It is, of course, important to recognize the urgency, the seriousness and the responsibility which ought to characterize all theological work; but the more natural implication is that theology is itself proclamation, not that it deals with proclamation, that it is normative in precisely the same way as the thinking behind the Sunday sermon is normative, and not that it provides a norm, a criticism and revision of that sermon. As a matter of fact, it is only by a kind of fiction that Dr. Barth himself can maintain that theology is concerned with preaching as its subject-matter, for his own theology is not concerned with preaching at all, but with God, revelation and faith. There is indeed always the possibility that by an ecclesiastical decision a particular theologian's results may be made definitive of orthodoxy, but, clearly, that decision is external to the theologian's theology proper and presupposes the more fundamental judgment that the results are true, and true, presumably, of God, revelation and faith.

[10] *The Doctrine of the Word of God*, p. 84. [11] *Ibid.*, p. 92.

While actually, however, Dr. Barth seems to put himself in the place of the Church, as we have said, he would not himself allow this description. He would say rather that the theologian takes his stand within the Church, in relation to a sign, namely, the Bible, and in recollection and expectation of its becoming an event whereby valid criticism and revision of the Church's proclamation takes place; and in this relation the theologian sets this proclamation over against the Word of God as he understands it, although it does not rest with him but with divine predestination whether the resultant theology is weighty criticism or not. What is it then that leads Dr. Barth to describe the matter in this way? Here, I think, there are two characteristic opinions of Dr. Barth's which deserve to come to the forefront as supplying the required explanation, the one because it seems to drive Dr. Barth away from what has seemed so obviously the true account of theology, the other because if it were true it would lend some support to the rather odd alternative description which Dr. Barth himself favours.

The former of these is Dr. Barth's rooted objection to the idea of system in connection with theology and especially in connection with dogmatic theology, or rather to the idea of systematic thinking about God, revelation and faith. If theological thinking is systematic thinking, the thought seems to be, then it cannot be concerned with these realities, its object must be something else related to these, such as the Church's proclamation. A systematic treatment of God, revelation and faith would be sinful,[12] for it would reduce these great realities to no more than ideas in a man's mind, and it could produce no more than a "self-centred theological speculation,"[13] raised in deference, not to the norm of God's revelation of Himself in Christ, but to what Dr. Barth calls "immanent regulations of critically reflective thought."[14] Moreover, it cannot be denied that Dr. Barth's criticism holds, not of all theological thinking which attempts to think systematically and coherently about the great realities of religion, but of a certain kind of such thinking. There is a type of thinking in which the *sarx* does systematically take up a position. There is in other words a type of thinking which is thoroughly self-possessed, in which that which is thought about is reduced to the status of a mere object, and in which all such objects fall into line around the thinking subject. Such thinking is closed thinking, in which a man is the master in his own intellectual house, in which too he can never be surprised or find himself out of his depth, and in which on the contrary he knows all the answers. What Dr. Barth does not see, however, is that such thinking is sinful, not because it employs ideas or tries

12Cf. *Credo*, p. 184. 13*The Doctrine of the Word of God*, p. 95.
14*Ibid.*, p. 94.

to be self-consistent, but simply and solely because it is closed, and that unsystematic thinking which glories in paradox could be equally closed and equally sinful. To reject *ab initio* all coherent thinking about God, revelation and faith is to be committed to at least three questionable and, indeed, mistaken opinions, that knowledge, in particular a knowledge of God, is possible without ideas, that ideas invariably act as a barrier between the mind and the reality of which they are ideas, and that loyalty to the subjective or, perhaps, immanent norm of self-consistency, for example, is quite incompatible with, and certainly not the instrument of, loyalty to the objective and transcendent norm of God's revelation of Himself in Jesus Christ. As against such contentions, however, it is evident that it is not ideas nor their mutual compatibility and coherence which render a system of thought and belief sinful and, in a religious sense, proud; it is rather the spirit of self-sufficiency and, one may say, lordship that may or may not permeate the system of thought which renders it accordingly corrupt or not corrupt. Manifestly, all our knowledge of God, with a possible exception in the case of mysticism, even the most humble knowledge and the most dependent on revelation, is of necessity a knowledge through the medium of ideas; and it is equally clear that whatever there may be of paradox and contradiction in that knowledge is a defect, whereas to insist upon the element of paradox for its own sake is to follow a course parallel to that of the sceptic who, as Descartes put it, seeks "nothing beyond uncertainty itself."

All this, however, would account only for the fact that Dr. Barth does not offer the obvious and, it would seem, the true description of theology. It does not account for the description which he does offer, namely, that theology is concerned with the Church's proclamation and seeks to provide for it a standard. What does produce this concept of theology is Dr. Barth's characteristic idea of revelation. It is no doubt very largely Dr. Barth's achievement that the idea of revelation is, rightly, in the forefront of contemporary theological discussion; but that does not alter the fact that Dr. Barth's own idea of revelation is a very peculiar one. Dr. Barth would certainly agree that what is revealed is not primarily propositions but a Person, and yet he comes perilously close to saying that it is not just a Person but a Person along with propositions or beliefs. What is revealed is not simply a Person, the Person of Christ, but a Person along with the complete determination of our being by the revelation (in a narrower sense), a determination which is completely effected, we are told, from the side of the object. If this is to be taken seriously as a *complete* determination, *entirely* from the side of the object, it seems wholly arbitrary to restrict the word 'revelation' to a narrower sense in which it stands

for the Person and to refuse it a broader sense in which it stands for the Person along with the determination of our being, a determination which is wholly and solely due to God who is revealing Himself.

This quite remarkable concept of revelation manifests its peculiarities in several directions. For one thing, revelation is, very strictly, an event, which cannot properly be recalled or anticipated, and "even that which this man and that apprehends and adopts as the Word of God in the event of faith and of which he can give an account, has already ceased to be what the Word of God addressed to him is in itself, and is his recollection of the Word addressed to him and his expectation of the Word to be addressed to him afresh."[15] It is against this that H. R. Mackintosh protested when he took exception to Dr. Barth's "excessive actualism" and his "aversion to the idea of a *state* of personal Christianity."[16] In the second place, the effect of this event in men is entirely determined by the event itself, is in fact part of the event, so that Dr. Barth speaks as freely of the event of faith as of the event of revelation and virtually makes faith a part of the revelation. Accordingly he can refer to "the givenness of the special and decisive conditions of dogmatics"[17] and to "an absolutely given criterion."[18] Thirdly, it is because of this that Dr. Barth is compelled to hold that it is completely a matter of divine predestination whether dogmatics achieves a just and weighty criticism and revision of the Church's proclamation or not, and, in ruling out human success in this matter, to rule out human failure too.

Thus Dr. Barth is led to his idea of dogmatic theology as normative of the Church's preaching. It is indeed a human work, but, one must suppose, it is a human work which may or may not be the vehicle of a divine work, and only as it is the vehicle of a divine work is it valid and valuable in the life of the Church. Thus dogmatic theology derives either "from the sole competent witness in this matter, namely, the man standing actually within the event of really knowing God, as He is set before us in Holy Scripture" or "from an onlooker, interested in this event but only from without."[19] Moreover, Dr. Barth advances this account of theology as the evangelical account in distinction from the Roman Catholic account which sees it as "an unfolding of the revealed truths immanent in the Church" and from the account of Protestant Modernism which regards it as "the exposition of the faith of the men united in the Church."[20]

[15] *The Doctrine of the Word of God*, p. 285; cf. p. 299.
[16] *Types of Modern Theology*, pp. 314f.
[17] *The Doctrine of the Word of God*, pp. 22f.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 289; cf. p. 293.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 227.
[20] *Ibid.*, p. 304.

It is evident, then, that the attempt to represent theology as doubly normative, as not only concerned with norms but as providing them also, stands or falls with an idea of revelation to which evangelical theology is not obviously or necessarily committed, an ideal of revelation which seems to me mechanistic rather than ethical.

Of course, in a sense, Dr. Barth is right. God does use the work of individuals to accomplish His purposes, He may use, for example, theological work to criticize and revise His Church's proclamation; but that is something which does not constitute the essential nature of theology, it is something which happens to it in the overruling wisdom of Almighty God, and it is a mistake to confuse the sovereign overlordship of God, wherein His thoughts are infinitely higher and longer than ours, with His no less sovereign, condescending grace and revelation, in which He seeks to bring our ways into harmony with His. The two of course are not in conflict, the former serves the latter as a means, we believe; but they are distinguishable, and only error can result from their confusion. The verdict of a famous Biblical scholar is relevant in this connection: "In the Old Testament predestination is not to character or fate, to salvation or its opposite, to eternal life or eternal punishment, but to service, or some particular form of service, for God and man."[21] Many will believe that Dr. Barth himself has been raised for such a service; but that does not alter the ethical character either of the revelation or of a man's response to it in life and in thought. The use and the results are God's; ours is the work in dependence on God's grace, and in theology it is the task of uttering as well and as clearly as we can the Gospel which God has given His Church to proclaim—and of saying as coherently as possible what we are doing.

[21]George Adam Smith, *Jeremiah*, p. 336.

A RE-READING OF TURGENEV

By P. A. Spalding, M.A.

To the making of books about Tolstoy and Dostoevsky there seems to be no end. Of Turgenev (1818-83), the eldest of the great trio of Russian novelists, we hear less. And, in spite of his recent appearances as a novelist in the 'Penguin' series and as a dramatist on the Third Programme, he is, of the three, undoubtedly the least read. Historically, however, Turgenev is important for two reasons. He was the first Russian writer to attract and hold the attention of the world outside Russia. Secondly, although among the general reading public he has long been eclipsed by his greater successors, among writers he has never ceased to hold his own. On account of his influence on other novelists, and particularly on Ernest Hemingway, he may be said to be the most important of the great trio in the history of the novel as a literary form.

Turgenev, unlike Tolstoy, is not for everybody. Not even for every expert or discriminating reader. It is doubtful, for instance, whether anyone who greatly admires Jane Austen can admire Turgenev at all, and *vice versa*. In all probability we are all of us potential 'Janeites' or persistent readers of Turgenev as we are all by temperament either Aristotelians or Platonists. It is at any rate a safe guess that whoever owns a set of the original yellow-bound Turgenevs counts them among his most cherished possessions.

Yet, re-reading after an interval and in quick succession the seventeen volumes of Constance Garnett's sensitive translation, what strikes one above all is the homogeneity, not to say the monotony, of Turgenev's work. Has any other novelist (one feels inclined to ask) with so limited an outlook won or deserved so great a reputation? Almost all his stories treat of one theme; almost all follow a similar pattern of development; all are tragedies; one novel only, *Smoke,* has a relatively happy ending; in all, the prevailing tone is one of resignation, a gentle melancholy, now darkened by despair, and now lit up by flashes of intense happiness.

It has been said of Jane Austen that in her six full-length novels she dealt six times with more or less the same plot. This might be said with even more justice of Turgenev. Take away from his works those that deal solely or primarily with the ill-starred love of a young man and a girl, and what remains? Only three volumes out of seventeen: only the *Sportsman's Sketches,* the *Prose Poems* and a handful of short stories. And not only are the novels as a

whole relatively slight variations on a single theme, but the protagonists are typical and vary almost as little. All Turgenev's heroes are young and well-disposed and weak: all his heroines, good and bad, are strong. The course of love between them is fated never to run smooth, scarcely indeed to last beyond its avowal, only on account of the weakness or will-lessness of the man. The lover betrays love either because, like Rudin, he cannot face its responsibilities, or, like Litvinov in *Smoke,* because he is seduced by an enchantress, or, like Alexey Petrovitch in *A Correspondence,* from sheer perversity, from an inclination to drift to ruin so uncontrolled that it appears almost a determination to do so. In Turgenev's world the traditional roles of the sexes are reversed. It is the women who make decisions and are prepared to act on them, while the men are passive and passively await their fate. Turgenev's men of action are few and failures. Solomin, the revolutionary in *Virgin Soil,* is a man not of iron but of wood. Insarov in *On the Eve* is not so much an individual as the incarnation of an idea. Perhaps Harlov, the 'Lear' of the Steppes, is the one strong man in this gallery of not contemptible but essentially 'superfluous' men, Sanins, Litvinovs, Lavretskys and the rest; men of feeling, but, unlike the Lizas, Natalyas and Elenas, incapable of passion; cursed, all of them, with Hamlet's irresoluteness, but unblessed with his intellect or imagination. Though Rudin and Bazarov, respectively Turgenev's first and greatest hero, have nothing else in common, their tragedy is the same. In the one fine speeches, in the other plain speaking, end as they began—in words.

Again, in Turgenev's world, of two loves the lower always wins. In *Smoke* Litvinov abandons the virtuous and affectionate Tatyana for the sinister Irina, the woman 'born to corrupt but never to be corrupted'. In *The Torrents of Spring* Sanin allows his love for Gemma to give place, practically without a struggle, to his infatuation for Maria. Even the strong man Bazarov in *Fathers and Children,* who despises love and rails against it, falls victim in the end to a futile passion for the one woman who cannot love him in return. For Turgenev, as for Catullus or Schopenhauer, love, or at any rate the love of a man for a woman, is a sickness, above all a sickness of the will, however incidentally beautiful it may be. "Is love a natural feeling?" asks Tchulkaturin in *The Diary of a Superfluous Man;* and answers, "Love is a sickness". "Love, indeed," writes the hero of *A Correspondence,* "is not a feeling at all, it's a malady . . . . Usually it takes possession of a person . . . . suddenly, against his will . . . . like cholera or fever." And if it does not come like a disease, love strikes "like lightning, and like lightning, brings death and ruin." (*Faust*).

A prepossession with the subject of unhappy love was, we may remember, characteristic of English, and indeed of European,

literature during this period, the second and third quarters of the nineteenth century. But this is a coincidence of subject merely, not of mood or treatment. There is nothing either Byronic or Pre-Raphaelite about Turgenev, and nothing Wertherian about the sorrows of his men and women. His pessimism is too genuine, too heartfelt, for him to glory in it. But inasmuch as it is emotional, springing directly from his sympathy with life, it differs also from the neural or cerebral pessimism of today, the pessimism of a Kafka or a Huxley, which results not so much from suffering as from a radical distrust of life, or a profound antipathy to it. It is upon the compensations for inevitable unhappiness, brief though they are, that Turgenev fixes his attention; a fact which no doubt explains why, in spite of the hopelessness of his view of the human predicament, Turgenev is ultimately consoling rather than depressing. For unless a writer can persuade himself that life, in spite of all appearance to the contrary, is worth living, he will hardly persuade anyone that he is worth reading. And it is the writer who has suffered most who most successfully communicates the consciousness of happiness.

There is a sameness not only in the themes but also in the settings of Turgenev's stories, a monotony which soothes and stimulates. Although they are carefully particularized, scenes and places, as Turgenev describes them, are also typical. They are not imaginary as in the romantic novel of the eighteenth century, but neither are they actual, as in the naturalistic novel of the nineteenth century. Each scene, we feel, is unmistakably somewhere, but it is also anywhere. We might ourselves be living in the little wooden manor-house, so clearly do we see the sunlight on the birches, smell the lilac, hear the creaking shutters and the water dripping in the mill-pool, were it not that our sensations are too vivid to be true. We are wide awake, but we are dreaming, as, in real life, in moments of abnormally acute perception, we sometimes feel we are. In some novelists, in Hardy, for example, nature is primary: in Turgenev it is not nature that is primary, but our perception of it. Hardy's scenes are immemorial and abiding; Turgenev's essentially transient; like beauty itself, seeming to exist only in the eye of the beholder. With Hardy we participate bodily in the scene; but with Turgenev we are present as spectators only, almost as disembodied spirits revisiting places intimately known and loved, but in another life. Turgenev's landscapes are more like Tennyson's than Hardy's; they have the simplicity of poetry, and as in poetry his effects are produced by the instinctive elimination rather than by the patient accumulation of detail. For instance:

Mihail Nikolaitch Ipatov had two houses facing each other

> on opposite sides of a huge pond. A long dam planted with silver poplars bordered this pond; almost on a level with the dam could be seen the red roof of a water-mill. Built exactly alike, painted the same lilac colour, the little houses looked as though they were glancing at one another with the shining panes of their clean little windows across the broad expanse of water . . . . There was an old park all round the pond: lime-trees formed avenues across it and stood in close groups about it . . . . the dense foliage of over-grown lilacs and acacias reached the very walls, covering all but the front of each house, from which winding brick paths ran down the slope. Bright coloured ducks and white and grey geese were swimming in separate flocks over the shining water of the pond . . . .[1]
>
> (*A Quiet Backwater*)

Nothing could be simpler than that. Nothing could be more expressive. It has the directness, the informality, almost the *naïveté*, of a drawing by a child of genius.

To think of Hardy is to think of Egdon Heath, probably in winter, at or about the time of sunset. To think of Turgenev in the same way is to think of a remote green corner of the steppes early on a fine morning in summer. It is to think, for instance, of this:

> It was a quiet summer morning. The sun stood already pretty high in the clear sky but the fields were still sparkling with dew; a fresh breeze blew fragrantly from the scarce awakened valleys and in the forest, still damp and hushed, the birds were merrily carolling their morning song. On the ridge of a swelling upland, which was covered from base to summit with blossoming rye, a little village was to be seen. Along a narrow by-road to this little village a young woman was walking in a white muslin gown, and a round straw hat, with a parasol in her hand . . . .
>
> (*Rudin*)

Perhaps too many of Turgenev's birds are nightingales, perhaps his skies are too often cloudless, to suit the matter-of-factness (one cannot call it the austerity) of modern taste. But though today, except in politics, we are afraid of sentiment, it should not be forgotten that 'sentimental' has not always been, and is not necessarily, a term of reproach.[2] Turgenev's feeling for nature comes from the heart and long experience: it is not the uncritical rapture of the townsman on holiday. His descriptions are never merely decorative. He is extremely sensitive, but not sentimental in the bad sense because he is never vague. Every natural detail,

[1] The quotations in this essay are from Constance Garnett's translation of Turgenev (Heinemann).

[2] We should allow, too, for the exigencies of translation. Passages in the novels of Pierre Loti, for example (who has affinities with Turgenev), which seem exaggerated in English can be read in the original without embarrassment.

as every trait of character, has been closely observed, and is recorded with the utmost precision and delicacy:

> The stillness was such that one could hear, a hundred paces off, the squirrel hopping over the dry leaves, and the broken twig just feebly catching at the other branches, and falling, at last, on the soft grass—to lie there for ever, not to stir again till it rotted away. The air, neither warm nor chill, but only fragrant, and as it were keen, was faintly, deliciously stinging in my eyes and on my cheeks. A long spider-web, delicate as a silken thread, with a white ball in the middle, floated smoothly in the air, and sticking to the butt-end of my gun, stretched straight out in the air—a sign of settled and warm weather . . . .
>
> (*A Lear of the Steppes*)

Only a man who had walked September woods not once but many times, and could instinctively recall the experience, could write of it like this.

Perhaps there are no two novelists, certainly no two who were compatriots and exact contemporaries, so opposite as Turgenev and Dostoevsky. The only thing they can be said to have in common is the Russian language. What Amiel wrote after hearing quartets by Mozart and Beethoven, he might well have written after reading novels by Turgenev and Dostoevsky:

> . . . . L'un est plus accompli, l'autre plus colossal. Le premier c'est la paix de l'art parfait, l'immédiate beauté; le second c'est le sublime, la terreur et la pitié, la beauté par retour . . . .
>
> (*Journal Intime*, 17 December, 1856.)

They are on opposite sides in politics. Turgenev was a convinced Westerner, Dostoevsky a passionate Slavophil. More fundamentally, while Dostoevsky's approach to experience is Christian and fanatically so, the spirit of Turgenev, gentlest of agnostics, is incapable of fanaticism of any kind. In this connection we may note that Liza, in Turgenev's *House of Gentlefolk*, the believer painted by the unbeliever, though a more superficial, is a more convincing portrait than Sonia, the believer painted by the believer, in Dostoevsky's *Crime and Punishment*.

But there is a fourth, less often mentioned, but no less important difference between these two. Dostoevsky, in striking contrast to Turgenev, is essentially *urban* in atmosphere; of all great writers he is perhaps the least affected by the beauty of the external world. So radical is this difference that it is suggested even in the titles of their novels: on the one hand, *Crime and Punishment, The Insulted and Injured, The Gambler, The House of the Dead;* and on the other, *A Sportsman's Sketches, Virgin Soil, First Love, The*

Torrents of Spring. The dominant atmosphere in Dostoevsky's novels is that of a dusty, fly-blown interior—how different from Turgenev, whose pages distil the freshness of a garden in spring, or the deep expectant stillness of a birch wood in autumn. Dostoevsky, when he does introduce 'nature', does so only as an intensification of mood, almost as an extension of personality, and not as something independent and eternal, in contrast to human character. Dostoevsky's great scenes are staged indoors and after dark; Turgenev's out of doors and in the sunlight. With Turgenev, even when we are indoors the windows stand wide open; even when it is dark the night is clear and warm. The name of any writer, if we know him well, evokes a certain mood or state of mind, while some suggest a type of landscape, and others even a time of day. Thus, with Dostoevsky we feel that it is midnight, with Tolstoy that it is midday, and with Turgenev that it is dawn or 'on the eve'.

Not only are almost all Turgenev's scenes set in the country—somewhere in Russia, "in one of the sleepiest corners of a sleepy province of the steppes", or on the Rhine, but, with trifling exceptions, the action of the stories takes place in a few weeks in spring or summer. It is as though Turgenev meant deliberately to emphasize the contrast between the tragedy of human life and the beauty of its setting, between man's wonder at the world in which he finds himself and the pettiness or futility of human hopes and aspirations. And it is no paradox that the writer who is the very symbol of the spring, who excels in the description of long idle summer days, should have declared (to de Goncourt):

> Moi, pour travailler, il me faut l'hiver, une gelée comme nous en avons en Russie, un froid astringent, avec des arbres chargés de cristaux . . . .

For to be able to communicate his impressions exactly, concretely, like the poet that he is, he must be able to look back; at summer from the vantage point of winter, at the freedom of the country from the prison of the town, at his beloved Russia as a voluntary exile in western Europe, at first love with the hopeless, but never cynical, disillusionment of middle-age.

Turgenev is a novelist's novelist. In the affections of novelists so diverse as Conrad, Galsworthy, Maupassant, Arnold Bennett, Charles Morgan and Ernest Hemingway, he has or had no rival. Not on account of his philosophy, for he had none, but because of his artistry, his impeccable sense of form. For this very reason, that he is the most artistic of novelists, he is not to be counted among the greatest. In the greatest writers there is a fundamental carelessness, a 'fine excess', the overspill of an uncontrollable creativity. As Yeats said, "Shakespeare is only a mass of magnificent fragments." He never wrote a perfect play, as the *Oedipus*

Tyrannus of Sophocles is perfect. Balzac, Dostoevsky, Dickens—none of them ever wrote a perfect novel, as *Rudin* or *Fathers and Children* is perfect. In all that they wrote there is a lack of proportion, which means a lack of control. Turgenev is always in control. His genius never runs away with him. He fills his exquisite glasses to the brim, and not a drop is spilled.

Happy is the artist who knows his limitations, of whom we feel that, much as he gives us, he has always something in reserve. Turgenev cannot, it is true, control a crowd as Tolstoy can, nor, in creating character, does he penetrate to subliminal levels, like Dostoevsky. But to belittle him on these accounts as critics so often do, is to find fault with Sophocles because he wrote his own plays instead of Shakespeare's, or to complain of a pear-tree because it does not bear apples. In fact, distance may be suggested in a manuscript miniature as effectively as in a panel painting or a fresco. Mysterious depths may be sounded in a few notes, in a simple melody, as well as in a complex symphonic passage—if the musician is Mozart. It is more important in an artist that his world should be homogeneous, coherent, recognizably *his,* than that it should be comprehensive. If the artist may be said to hold the mirror up to nature, then it is his reflective capacity that matters, not the extent or intrinsic value of the scene reflected.

Ordinarily it is those novels or aspects of a novel most interesting to the novelist's contemporaries which are most boring to posterity, just as in poetry it is precisely those allusions which for the poet are most up to date, which 'date' the most. Milton's allusion to the telescope, an instrument which since his time has altered out of recognition, is less effective, less moving, than his allusions to scythes or 'leaves in Vallombrosa', things which remain, for us as for him, identically the same. Similarly, the scientific novels of Wells, like the social propaganda in Dickens, so exciting to contemporaries, are now unreadable. An artist cannot manipulate current events except symbolically: if he is to use them he must somehow relate them to the timeless human issues they involve. In other words, he must choose, since no man can be both, whether to be an artist or a partisan. Turgenev—and it is one of his greatest merits—though often prejudiced as a man, never forgets that as an artist it is his business to produce a work of art, and not a sermon or a pamphlet. It is the measure of his success that the hostility aroused in Russia by his novels is incomprehensible to the reader unversed in Russian history. Thus it is quite possible for an Englishman to read *Smoke, Fathers and Children* or *Virgin Soil* without even realizing that they are *romans à thèse,* so successfully is the thesis subordinated; in a sense, so unimportant is it. Though among the most 'contemporary' ever written, these novels, possessing also the permanent contemporaneity of art, retain their

freshness unimpaired. They are outmoded, if at all, not as is so much of Balzac or of Dickens, but only as Shakespeare is, that is to say, formally and not substantially. For only a great artist can write with deep feeling of the present and avoid rhetoric. Only a poet can make politics as permanently interesting as passion.

It happens often enough that we lay down a novel with the feeling that the fragment of life depicted in it is more real than the life which actually surrounds us. We part from the characters with regret, as though from friends, and from the scenes in which they have played their parts, as though from actual places. Turgenev, almost alone among novelists, can create this illusion and inspire this regret within the limits of a short-story. After reading, for example, the fifty pages of *A Quiet Backwater,* we feel that we could hardly know the family at Ipatovka any better in five hundred. And as with a complete work, on however small a scale, so with a single character. Mlle. Boncourt, the old French governess in *Rudin,* a book of nearly three hundred pages, receives in all perhaps thirty lines. Yet not only does she come alive: she is, in her own right, a memorable figure. Most of the world's great novels could be improved by pruning. We have only to think of the social and religious propaganda in Tolstoy, the deliberate padding in Dickens, the shameless digressions in Scott and Balzac, the mass of unassimilated material in Proust. But in a novel by Turgenev, as in a poem, nothing can be altered without spoiling the effect, nothing omitted without disturbing the balance of the whole. So direct, so natural, so lifelike, is the impression produced upon us by a novel of Turgenev, that it is only when in cold blood we come to analyse it that we realize how simple, indeed how threadbare, is its plot; how little, in other words, Turgenev's art depends upon suspense.

And if his plots are simple, so too are his technical devices. How simple, for instance, and how effective, are the little prologues and epilogues, peculiar to Turgenev, in which he sketches—'etches' would be a better word—the events which precede and follow the action of the story, or the entrance and exit of an individual character. It is Turgenev's almost invariable practice, before introducing an important character, to epitomize his previous history from birth, so that before he appears in person, we are thoroughly familiar with his background. Detached from the action, these little biographies, like vertical lines intersecting the smooth flow of the narrative, serve as resting-places, to relieve tension or to introduce a change of key.

Analagous, but more decisive, is the effect of the epilogue, or post-script to the story proper, in which we meet one or more of the chief characters for the last time, after an interval, perhaps of years.

These epilogues, sometimes in conjunction with the prologue, as in *The Torrents of Spring,* serve to frame the picture, but also fulfil a deeper purpose. They are used by Turgenev, who dislikes a too emphatic ending, to suggest the inconclusiveness of life. By contrast with a normal ending, of a piece with, not detached from, the body of the narrative, these vivid, isolated, final glimpses create a stronger, more mysterious sense of life's continuity. We are affected as when, in mountainous country, the mist, eddying about a distant summit, lifts for an instant, then falls again impenetrably.

Some of the most memorable passages in Turgenev occur in these epilogues. Who can forget the last glimpse vouchsafed us of Evlampia, Harlov's daughter, the Regan of the *Lear of the Steppes*? Or the mysterious lack of finality in the fate of Elena in *On the Eve*? Or the last paragraph of *First Love,* a passage, in its psychological insight, reminiscent of Proust, and a fitting conclusion to Turgenev's finest story? The narrator has just told how he heard without pain, almost with indifference, of the death in childbirth of the girl whom, as a schoolboy a few years earlier, he had loved as only a schoolboy can.

> I remember (he continues) a few days after I heard of Zinaïda's death, I was present, through a peculiar, irresistible impulse, at the death of a poor old woman who lived in the same house as we. Covered with rags, lying on hard boards, with a sack under her head, she died hardly and painfully. Her whole life had been passed in the bitter struggle with daily want . . . . One would have thought, surely she would rejoice at death, at her deliverance, her rest. But yet, as long as her decrepit body held out . . . . until her last forces left her, the old woman crossed herself, and kept whispering, 'Lord, forgive my sins'; and only with the last spark of consciousness, vanished from her eyes the look of fear, of horror of the end. And I remember that then, by the death-bed of that poor old woman, I felt aghast for Zinaïda, and longed to pray for her, for my father—and for myself.

"While a man is living," declares the hero of *The Diary of a Superfluous Man,* "he is not conscious of his own life; it becomes audible to him, like a sound, after the lapse of time." All Turgenev's stories produce this impression: they are sound and stir becoming audible after the lapse of time; they are music heard at a distance, or through walls. We may repeat of Turgenev as a writer what he says of his own Rudin as a speaker: "He is the master of almost the greatest secret . . . . He knows how in striking one chord of the heart to set all the others vaguely quivering and resounding." And all Turgenev's stories, even the slightest, except perhaps one or two of the late fantasies, are impregnated with an identifying essence, that colour or tonality peculiar to a

writer, which, though unanalysable, distinguishes him from every other writer. Whatever he touches, and at whatever point, the touch is unmistakably his own. He is present as a whole in each and any of his parts—in a writer the clearest evidence not necessarily of greatness but of originality; the proof that, whatever talents he may or may not possess, he is possessed by genius.

"After forty", Turgenev once declared, "the meaning of life may be summed up in the one word—renouncement." To Turgenev, contemplating his achievement in middle-age, life seemed, as it seemed to Yeats, as it must seem to any artist whose impulse is purely lyrical, "a preparation for something that never happens". Though all his stories are love stories, not one of them ends with wedding bells. The most that can be expected for a Turgenev hero is that he should rise one day 'a sadder and a wiser man', having learnt the great lesson of resignation, neither to hope nor to despair, but to accept. Once only, at the close of his greatest novel, does Turgenev introduce a note of hope. Bazarov's old parents, heartbroken at the death of their son, visit his grave.

> Can it be that their prayers, their tears are fruitless? Can it be that love, sacred, devoted love, is not all-powerful? Oh, no! However passionate, sinning and rebellious the heart hidden in the tomb, the flowers growing over it . . . . tell us not of eternal peace alone, of that great peace of 'indifferent' nature; they tell us too of eternal reconciliation and of life without end.
>
> (*Fathers and Children*)

But more significant for the understanding of Turgenev than this single outburst is the fact that his saints, such characters as the old Bazarovs in *Fathers and Children,* Bassistov in *Rudin,* Pyotr Vassilyitch and Verotchka in *The Two Friends,* to whom alone he allows the possibility of happiness, are not remarkable people, neither very strong, nor very intelligent, nor very virtuous; neither poets, nor prophets, nor idealists, but simple people, who make few demands on life, who not only accept, but cheerfully accept their lot, who have learnt their lesson without having to be taught. Turgenev was not a Christian, but the Christian virtue of humility is the Turgenevian virtue *par excellence.* In Turgenev's novels, as in the Gospel, it is the meek who inherit the earth. And it is Turgenev, the poet of romantic love, the eternal celibate who declared that artists for the sake of art should never marry, who assures us that the most commonplace of fates, a humdrum domesticity, is best of all.

> Pyotr Vassilyitch, his wife and all his household lead a very monotonous life, quiet and peaceful; they are happy . . . . for there is no other happiness on earth.
>
> (*The Two Friends*)

No-one today who is not already a devoted reader of Turgenev is likely to want to read about him. He is in many ways so typical of his time—a time with which we are peculiarly out of sympathy—and his appeal, although so strong, is so limited that, unless his novels happen deeply to interest a modern reader, they are unlikely to interest him at all. Unless one is a novelist and reads him for the sake of his technical mastery, or unless one knows Russian and reads him, as one may read Tennyson, for the fineness of his diction, one must, it seems, share his outlook in order to read him with pleasure. Beside the vast structures of Tolstoy and Dostoevsky, Turgenev's little novels, so simple in form, so monotonous in theme, seem like a sheaf of Elizabethan lyrics beside the plays of Shakespeare. After the full orchestra the solo instrument is apt to sound (until the ear becomes attuned) a little colourless, a little thin.

But it is on his own merits rather than comparatively that we ought to judge a writer, and Turgenev's merits, if not so obvious now as they once were and will be again, are very real. If he attempted less than his great contemporaries, in some ways he succeeded better than they. What he set out to do—and there never was a more deliberate writer than Turgenev—he did incomparably. However (temporarily) unfashionable he may be, he will always be worth reading because, though not the greatest even of Russian novelists, though not, perhaps, compared with Tolstoy, Balzac, Dickens, a 'great' novelist at all, he is the most *perfect* of all novelists and the purest of prose-poets.

REVIEWS

The reviews are in four divisions:

Theology and relevant studies: works of scholarship ranging from dogmatic theology and church history to psychology and cosmology.

Religion, life and work: books concerned with the daily application of religion and its popular exposition.

Miscellanea, a limited selection from current general literature.

Periodical publications.

THEOLOGY
AND RELEVANT STUDIES

Schism in the Early Church. By S. L. GREENSLADE. 247 pp. S.C.M. 21s.

Let no one think this is a work of concern only to the student of early Church History. It is, on the other hand, a most valuable contribution to intelligent study of one of our acute contemporary problems: why is the Church divided, and how can its divisions be healed? Prof. Greenslade's approach to the problem is by way of his own field—early Church History—but that approach may have much to commend it. It is made clear that divisions within the Church have arisen from time to time all up history; it is shown that the reasons for division invariably fall into one or more main categories; and our present problems are revealed for what they are. I earnestly hope that all who are concerned about the divided Church will read this book. Those who are not well versed in Church History will find it heavy going, but not impossibly so. Such readers should first study the appendix, which gives a useful factual summary of the main early schisms. It is also a help to the ordinary reader that all Latin and Greek quotations are translated.

In his first chapter Dr. Greenslade discusses unity, heresy and schism. With certain safeguards, he prefers to think of the Church as really a unity, its divisions being within that unity: "the one holy catholic and apostolic Church exists, on earth, *in* its divisions" (p. 11). Heresy is the holding of doctrines that conflict with the dogma of the main stream of the Church; schism is separation from its organization and discipline. But the two obviously overlap, and though a heretic might wish to remain in the Church, a schismatic is almost inevitably also a heretic in some particular. In the next five chapters the causes of schism are carefully analysed, with apt illustrations from the early schisms. The causes fall into three main divisions: genuine differences in theological opinion or questions of conduct and discipline; tensions arising from economic, social and racial differences; personal ambitions and rivalries. While utterly deploring schism, Dr. Greenslade frankly recognizes that the fault has not always been entirely on the side of the schismatic. The larger body, whether Rome or some other, has sometimes erred by the opposite errors of rigidity in dogma or laxity in standards: "Liberty is a positive value which has so often been threatened by undue insistence upon authority that revolt and schism were in the circumstances necessary and right" (p. 206).

As to the way ahead, since the author seems to hold "that there is schism within the Church, rather than schisms outside the Church" (p. 30), there is

no valid barrier to intercommunion: "We ought to be in communion with one another; the case against it is not good enough" (p. 221). Intercommunion, he thinks, would be the first step towards reunion or at least federation, and all who name the name of Christ should have enough of His spirit to make the necessary concessions or permit the necessary latitudes: "If, for example, there is still any lurking hostility between the Church of England and the English Free Churches arising out of past squabbles . . . there should be an end of it. The major crimes of Christians against each other . . . must be forgiven. Again, the mere existence of schism has allowed us to remain in considerable ignorance of each other's principles and customs, an ignorance the extent of which even those who are engaged in discussions between churches are surprised to discover in themselves" (p. 211). The different parts of the Church in schism may well have preserved or gained insights which all should now share; obstinacy or mere conservatism in maintaining particular positions should be weighed against the sin of maintaining division within the Body of Christ; our divisions give the non-Christian a justifiable handle against us.

Dr. Greenslade has shown commendable courage in writing this book. Many both within and outside his own Church will criticize it. But his arguments are based on sound scholarship and are reasoned with almost inescapable logic. He has honestly endeavoured to understand and assess conflicting points of view. He has an earnest concern for the unity of the Church. It may be noted that he says very little about Rome. He probably recognizes the utter hopelessness of any effective steps in that direction, and prefers to set his hopes on the establishment of some real unity in the rest of Christendom.

A. R. Vine.

Concise Bible Commentary. By W. K. Lowther Clarke. 996 pp. S.P.C.K. 30s.

The one-volume commentary is probably intended for those who are unable or unwilling to devote much of their library space to theology, but are glad to have at least one book giving them an intelligent approach to the background and problems of the Bible. Authors of one-volume commentaries should therefore bear in mind that their work may well be the only one of its kind on the shelves of the purchaser. Dr. Lowther Clarke discharges this isolated responsibility in a way which gives his work very favourable comparison with any other one-volume commentary of recent years. Over 600 pages are devoted to brief introductions and verse by verse commentaries on all the books of the Bible and the Apocrypha. This is preceded by nearly thirty articles, occupying well over 300 pages, dealing with history, geography, text, canon, miracle, interpretation, theology, criticism, and many similar subjects. This division of space is wise, as the reader who has mastered these preliminary studies will be far on the way to being able to supply his own commentary, for background knowledge is better than the quoting of an "authority" on some particular verse.

Dr. Clarke has carried through a stupendous task, and he has carried it through amazingly well. Scholars will tremble at his boldness in dealing himself with the multitude of specialist studies involved. Inevitably, his competence varies from field to field. Detailed criticism is hardly in place, but my general impression is that the author was more at home in historical and critical fields than in those more theological and philosophical. The articles on background, text and canon are particularly good for their length; those on miracle and doctrine are not quite so satisfying. However, the final impression is of a great task excellently done, and there is no one-volume commentary I would place above it. The standpoint can perhaps

be described as liberal orthodox. Dr. Clarke is fully aware of the results of modern study, and accepts the inevitable findings. But he is convinced that there is ultimate truth behind the dogmas of the Church, and he sees no reason for forsaking them in anything essential. One could criticize details; but it would be ungenerous to do so, for there are no major faults, and the whole work bears ample evidence of painstaking and responsible scholarship. Perhaps the most valuable addition would have been a bibliography. The reader wishing to pursue any particular matter further would value assistance of that kind. One other point, and this applies to quite a number of recent books. There was a time when the description of an author's offices and distinctions on the title page was absurdly overdone. Now we go to the other extreme. This book is "by the Reverend W. K. Lowther Clarke". Who is he, and what weight can we ascribe to his opinions? We at least ought to be told that he is M.A., D.D. (Cantab.), Canon of Chichester, sometime Fellow of Jesus College, and for thirty years Editorial Secretary of the S.P.C.K. Such description is not immodest: the reader wants to know.

A. R. VINE.

The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls. By H. H. ROWLEY. 133 pp. Blackwell. 16s.

This book consists of three lectures reviewing the position of the study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and setting out a positive view of their origin. The views expressed are those to be found also in Professor Rowley's article in the *Expository Times* for September, 1952, an article which provides a useful brief introduction to the material of this book, as it covers the same ground succinctly and without any attempt at a complete account of the various theories or of the mass of literature which has now accumulated on the subject.

The first lecture describes both the Zadokite Fragments and the finds near the Dead Sea, surveying the various types of evidence for the discussion of date and origin. Important is the stress laid on the long period of development from the time of the composition of the earliest of the works involved to the time of the deposit in the Cave. When we speak of the "date of the Scrolls" we must make clear what is meant. The second lecture gives some indication of the relationship of the Scrolls to the Zadokite Fragments, and reviews the enormous variety of theories proposed concerning their origin. This paves the way for the exposition in the third lecture of Professor Rowley's own view. He looks to the second century B.C. to provide a reasonable historical and religious background for the emergence of the sect. The "War of the Sons of Light" and the "Habakkuk Commentary" would belong to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes; at a later stage a migration of the sect to Damascus is reflected in the Zadokite Fragments, and the Manual of Discipline provides an indication of the inner workings of a sect akin to the Essenes. The deposit must belong to a later date, perhaps as late as the second century A.D.

This survey and exposition, not always easy to read because of the mass of evidence and the inevitable complexities which arise from it, invites two main comments. First, we shall be grateful to Professor Rowley for so complete a survey of the literature. The time is now ripe for someone with this knowledge of the bibliography to eliminate the unessential, for with so great a mass of comment, mainly in small articles, we shall need to discriminate if discussion is to continue profitably and without too great a burden of references. Second, the view proposed has much to commend it; but with no evidence so precise as is found, for example, in the Book of Daniel, it cannot be more than theory. Maccabean dating is attractive, because of

our knowledge of that period, but there is need for caution in fitting Biblical and non-Biblical material too rigidly into the pattern of the history as we know it, since to a contemporary events and persons may have been of importance which to us are unknown or relatively insignificant.

PETER R. ACKROYD.

Ecclesiastes or The Preacher. A new translation. By A. D. POWER. 156 pp. Longmans, Green & Co. 8s. 6d.

This short commentary presents a readable translation of the text, with notes which are frequently helpful in explaining details of the meaning. Some few inaccuracies of translation occur (e.g. iv 10, vii 15, viii 5-6, xii 1) and discrepancies between text and notes (e.g. ii 21). The glossary contains some useful information, though a fuller treatment of the word "folly" would be valuable.

The general reader will find much of value, but will wish that the author had more often expressed his own judgment instead of merely setting out opposing views (e.g. on the "allegory" of ch. xii). Often reference is given to a host of commentators, some of whom barely deserve mention, and their relative importance is obscured by the profusion of initials which give both introduction and notes an algebraic appearance ("There is certainly a general likeness between K. and O.K." p. 31) and demand much turning of pages to find the key.

PETER R. ACKROYD.

Jesus, Master and Lord: a study in the historical truth of the Gospels. By H. E. W. TURNER. Mowbrays. 21s.

Professor Turner of Durham has very distinguished gifts for lucid and exact exposition of complex problems. In this book he has applied these gifts to the task of setting forth in plain English, unimpeded by technical footnotes, the results of the literary analysis of the Gospels, though in some few places the absence of references may weaken the exposition. He surveys the documents, the reconstruction of the ministry, Jesus as Teacher and Prophet, Wonderworker, Messiah, the Son of the Father; in addition, he studies the teaching of Jesus in detail, and sets the Resurrection as the conclusion of the whole matter. Professor Turner pays only limited attention to the Fourth Gospel, but otherwise gives a masterly and balanced analysis of the conflicting judgments of scholars, and a lucid and accurate summary of up-to-date information. His treatments, for example, of Rabbinic literature (pp. 131—136), of the Son of Man (pp. 196—205), of the Kingdom of God (pp. 239—260), of the foundation of the Church (pp. 260—300), crystallize the results of long decades of study in clear terms. The book will be of great service to all teachers and students of the Gospels preparing for examinations.

But Professor Turner has the defects of his qualities. He calls his book a study in the historical truth of the Gospels; but he cannot imagine a sound historical judgment which does not accept with almost unaltered literalness any statement in the Gospels. On the question of miracles he is willing to put nature-miracles into a theological suspense account, without, however, considering whether he ought also to put their factual occurrence into an historical suspense account. He put caveats against Professor R. H. Lightfoot's scepticism as to historical fact, and is critical of Professor C. H. Dodd's alteration of the "setting-in-life" of the Parables. Many readers will have sympathy with him here, yet his own conception of history is markedly wooden as compared with that of Professor Dodd. Theologically, too, the book is disappointing. At one point (p. 225) he says that he will show how the theology of the Gospels issued in the classical Christology, but he does not fulfil the promise. His treatment of the Ascension is notice-

ably elementary both historically and theologically, and his reluctance to ascribe any of the reported teaching of Jesus to the Early Church blurs his treatment of eschatology (cf. p. 200). But though the book is hardly likely to command general assent in the wider treatment of its themes, it is a notable contribution to the assimilation of the results of literary criticism.

H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

Design for Life. By A. M. HUNTER. 124 pp. S.C.M. 7s. 6d.

This is an exposition of the Sermon on the Mount dealing in turn with its making, its exegesis, and its meaning. Dr. Hunter describes the Gospel message of redemption through the life, death and resurrection of Christ as the divine indicative upon which is founded the imperative, the ethic of Jesus, which is summarized by the evangelist in the collection of sayings known as the Sermon. This ethic, Dr. Hunter emphasizes, is a prophetic ethic rather than a new law, and is a "design for life" for *Christians*. This short but invaluable study still further enhances the author's reputation for attractive and lucid exposition of New Testament topics for non-experts, and is a rich mine of suggestions for preachers and teachers.

A. J. B. HIGGINS.

Tracts Ascribed to Richard Bancroft. Edited by ALBERT PEEL. 169 pp. Cambridge University Press. 21s.

With this work Dr. Peel returned to one of his early fascinations. As long ago as 1915 he published the early Puritan documents contained in *The Seconde Parte of a Register*. The present tracts, found in a previously unpublished MS. in the Library of St. John's College, Cambridge, are two pieces of vigorous controversy against Puritanism, both Precisian, i.e. Presbyterian, and Brownist. "There is nowhere any indication of the author, but any student of Elizabethan church history who has used Bancroft's . . . works", Dr. Peel says, "would say 'Bancroft' "; and he offers ground to substantiate this judgment. The date he reckons as between 1583 and 1585, probably 1584, when Bancroft, who was to become Bishop of London and later Archbishop of Canterbury, was a Prebendary of Ely and in close touch with Cambridge, the stronghold of emergent Puritanism. One of the pieces printed, 'The Most Principall and Chiefe Heresies in R. Brownes Booke', is brief and little more than a list of charges against Browne for teaching Anabaptism, Montanism, Donatism, Catharism and the rest; the other, 'Certen Slaunderous Speeches against the Present Estate of the Church of Englande Published to the People by the Precisians', which is longer, is more reasoned and comparatively free from abuse. It is to be regretted that Dr. Peel did not provide more in the way of annotation to these documents; but students of Elizabethan religious history will be glad to have access to them and will be conscious of a debt of gratitude to Professor Norman Sykes for his generosity in seeing them through the press since their editor's death.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

William Lloyd, 1627-1717: Bishop, Politician, Author and Prophet. By A. TINDAL HART. 282 pp. S.P.C.K. 30s.

Biographies of late seventeenth-century bishops are popular at present. We have had studies of Edward Tenison, John Sharp (also by Dr. Hart) and Jeremy Taylor; and lives of Henry Compton and Seth Ward are promised. For later generations William Lloyd's claim to remembrance is mainly as politician: he was one of the Seven Bishops imprisoned in 1688 and in 1689 he adhered to William III, at whose coronation he assisted, though as yet only Bishop of St. Asaph. For his own generation he was also the author and prophet, the scholar who persuaded Matthew Poole to undertake his

Synopsis, assisted the polymath John Wilkins, financed a new edition of the Codex Alexandrinus and "first discovered the genius of Richard Bentley", and was himself "the greatest chronologist of his generation". Concentration on biblical chronology led to absorption in prophecy and this to his turning prophet himself, "Old Mysterio" as a wag called him; but such sane heads at Evelyn's and Burnet's were inclined to take his prophecies seriously. These formed part of the recrudescence of millenarianism which marks the years either side of 1700 and in which the refugees from the Cevennes (the witnesses in *Revelation* xi according to Lloyd) had a hand. It remains odd to find a bishop in this *galère*.

Lloyd held St. Asaph, Lichfield and Worcester successively, and on his episcopal activities and discipline Dr. Hart is full and illuminating, drawing largely on the Lloyd-Baker MSS., which are his own discovery, as well as on many others. The Pakington MSS. in Lord Hampton's possession might have thrown light on Lloyd's "campaign of vilification and abuse" of Sir John Pakington; the Baxter MSS. at Dr. Williams' Library show that the figure paid by St. Martin's-in-the-Field during Lloyd's incumbency for Baxter's meeting-house was £28, not "the handsome rental of £40" *per annum*. "Slippery and somewhat unreliable", "sitting on the fence" is how Dr. Hart portrays Lloyd, a characterization which may be illustrated from Lloyd's attitude to Dissenters. In 1681, when Baxter included him among the "Moderate Bishops", he sought conferences with the Presbyterian Philip Henry, and the Quaker Richard Davies (who was a hatter, not a ratter!); but in 1682-3 he called them all "bloody wretches", and "refused them the use of holy ground for their dead". GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

Hugh Bourne: 1772-1852. By JOHN T. WILKINSON. Epworth Press. 203 pp. 18s. 6d.

Hugh Bourne is not a major luminary in English church history, but God made the stars also, and Bourne was certainly a burning and a shining light, the founder of Primitive Methodism, in which membership rose from 200 in 1811 to 33,720 in 1829. He deserved just such a careful, pious, sober-sided biography as Mr. Wilkinson has written. Its main value is that it is based on Bourne's MS. journals; its weakness that no larger context is presented than the purification of Methodism which Bourne intended. In his simplicity, earthy, of the people, in his combination of heavenly-mindness with self-satisfaction ("I grow more and more spiritual every day"), of organizing ability with mystical experience, "Mr. Hugh Bourne makes me think of George Fox, the Quaker", as a contemporary remarked. But Fox (in Penn's words) "was an original, being no man's copy", while Bourne lacked the spark of genius. For the comparative study of revivalism this makes Bourne the safer yard-stick.

GEOFFREY F. NUTTALL.

St. Teresa of Jesus, and other Essays and Addresses. By E. ALLISON PEERS. 315 pp. Faber & Faber, 25s.

By the recent death of Professor Allison Peers this country has lost its leading Spanish scholar, and the universities their most lively critic (Bruce Truscot). This book appears just after his death and fills in certain gaps left in his earlier works. It includes learned essays on St. Teresa, St. John of the Cross, Spanish mysticism and Cervantes. They are marked by Professor Peers' well-known, meticulous scholarship (who but he could have written at length on the syntax of St. Teresa's letters?), his vast knowledge of Spanish literature and his somewhat uncritical enthusiasm for Spanish religion. It is a weakness of all Professor Peers' writings on mysticism that he rarely moves beyond the orbit of Spanish Catholicism and

so he lacks the material for a comparative study. The word "mysticism", for instance, badly needs definition, but the nearest that Professor Peers comes to it is "the realization of the greatness of God and the nothingness of man" (p. 176). Does this, however, mean anything more than the Buddhist ideal and does it mean as much as "personal experience" as understood by George Herbert or Charles Wesley? In Professor Peers' pages as well as in most of the authors with whom he deals it seems to have little contact either with the needs of men or with Biblical Christianity. This clearly is a provocative book, authoritative both in its learning and in its limitations, so closely has Professor Peers identified himself with his theme.

A. VICTOR MURRAY.

The Coasts of the Country: an Anthology of Prayer drawn from the early English Spiritual Writers. Edited by CLAIRE KIRCHBERGER. 266 pp. Harvill Press. 15s.

Mediæval England had her share of Catholic mystics, but the extent is only just now being realized. Richard Rolle, Julian of Norwich, Edmund Rich and Walter Hilton and the anonymous author of *The Cloud of Unknowing* have long been familiar classics. Miss Kirchberger has now collected a large mass of unpublished and, for the most part, anonymous manuscript material of the same quality scarcely known at all. They are the hempen home-spun meditations of simple English Christians, but some of them show the same keen insight in a crude form which John Bunyan showed in a more intelligent and intelligible form in a later age. Miss Kirchberger deserves warm thanks for this service, and she could well have dispensed with the partisan "introduction" by another hand. The title comes from a remark in the *Mirror of Simple Souls* (XV century), "This soul hath perceived by divine light the coasts of the country there her owed to be".

A. V. MURRAY.

Little Book of Eternal Wisdom and Little Book of Truth. By HENRY SUSO, tr. with introduction and notes by J. M. CLARK. 212 pp. Faber & Faber. 18s.

Some Christians are as at home in the writings of the mystics as a fish in water. This grace is witheld from others. Mr. J. M. Clark, who last year gave us a translation of Suso's life, here offers two of his mystical treatises. Suso was the devoted but not uncritical disciple of Eckhart; he had a poetical as well as mystical spirit. This is unfortunately a small book for a great price, but it will be welcomed and deeply enjoyed by all lovers of mediæval mysticism.

N. MICKLEM.

Missions Under the Cross. Addresses delivered at the Enlarged Meeting of the Committee of the International Missionary Council at Willingen, in Germany, 1952; with Statements issued by the Meeting. Edited by Norman Goodall. 264 pp. Edinburgh House Press. 12s. 6d.

The Willingen meeting of the International Missionary Council represented an important cross-section of Christian thought about the world mission of the Church, both because of its international character and because it related world wide study of that mission to other aspects of Christian thought. The findings of the meeting are important because they give a conspectus of the agreement of those throughout the world who are directly engaged in the world mission, on priorities in that mission and on its theological basis. Most of the statements which constitute the second part of this volume have already been published separately in the pamphlet "The missionary obligation of the Church" (Edinburgh House Press, 1952).

But Willingen was not only concerned with questions arising from the

immediate perilous situation in which the world mission stands. It sought to relate those questions to the significant movements which have been taking place in recent years in the fields of Biblical and theological studies. Most of the addresses given at the evening plenary sessions at Willingen, which constitute the longer part of this volume, are concerned with the Biblical and theological basis of the missionary enterprise. Not only do they provide a record of what was said there; they have also an intrinsic importance as a considerable contribution in their own right to theological thought.

Dr. Norman Goodall contributes an introduction which sets the addresses in their context within that process of thought and action of which, as his title suggests, Willingen was a milestone, not the terminus. There is also a survey of the world mission by Mr. E. J. Bingle which is a remarkable feat of lucid compression.

This is an important book for anyone who wishes to keep abreast of world wide thinking on the world task of the Church, as well as for anyone who recognizes, what is becoming increasingly apparent, that theology cannot ignore "missions" any more than missions can ignore theology. We may be the more thankful that the I.M.C. has compressed the "meat" of Willingen into one volume. (The Madras Meeting took seven and the Jerusalem Meeting eight!) R. K. ORCHARD.

Mediæval Philosophy. By FREDERICK C. COPLESTON. 194 pp. Methuen. 7s. 6d.

The day has gone when it was fashionable to assume that there was nothing to be learned from all the philosophising which took place between Aristotle and Francis Bacon; and one of the remarkable facts of modern theology has been a great revival of interest in St. Thomas Aquinas and, as a result, in mediæval philosophy as a whole. There is abundant room, therefore, for a small book which will convey to those who are not experts in this field some reliable notion of the shape and development of philosophy in this period and some account of the teaching of its great philosophers. It is safe to say that such a task could not have been given to more competent hands than Fr. Copleston's. The two great merits of his book, apart from the excellence of its style, are that his accounts of the teaching of each philosopher are clear and just, and that he portrays the development of mediæval thought with remarkable felicity. It is good to see Duns Scotus and William of Ockham given due prominence; and the chapter on the Franciscan Philosophers is of unusual interest; and there is much more in this great little book, which, we may be sure, will afford to generations of students so very much more than a reliable text-book: it will surely arouse an abiding interest in its theme. JOHN HUXTABLE.

The Meaning of Existence, a metaphysical enquiry. By DOM MARK PONTIFEX and DOM ILLTYD TRETHOWAN. 179 pp. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

This book will afford good hunting for the few. These few are the metaphysicians and, more particularly, those who are at home in the terminology of the Thomist tradition. Two monks of Downside reconsider together but in separate essays some of the leading themes of scholastic philosophy, such as St. Anselm's 'ontological argument', the distinction between potency and act, and between essence and existence. How, they ask, for instance, can essence be regarded as something to which existence can be added, when existence applies to the whole of reality? "Essence is always known as existing, either objectively or in the mind". Potency and act in the creature, says Fr. Pontifex (but Fr. Trethowan hesitates) are objectively identical.

The Source of all assertibilty is God. This little book is very much to be commended to the philosopher, but not with confidence to others.

N. MICKLEM.

The Relationship between Psychology and Science. By WILLIAM TAYLOR. 244 pp. Allen & Unwin. 12s. 6d.

This is a work of sound scientific knowledge and acute reasoning power. But its title is misleading, as the real theme of the book is a study of the structure and nature of the Universe. The word "pantheism" is not mentioned, yet actually this work is a very skilful restatement in modern terms of a pantheistic view. The author does mention his agreement with Spinoza (p. 202), but that is more or less an aside. Indeed, the author is little indebted to anyone else. He has worked out his own scheme from the fundamentals. His science is sound and his logic is rigid, and in spite of some peculiar nomenclature his case is as strong as the case for pantheism can be made. Dr. Taylor is a competent physicist and chemist, and his work is of value in showing his brethren that a theistic (even if pantheistic) view of the Universe can be logically expounded. His pantheism cannot be opposed on scientific, but only on philosophical and theological grounds. It should be stated that this is not a popular book, and cannot be followed without a good knowledge of higher mathematical physics.

A. R. VINE.

History of Philosphy, Eastern and Western. 2 Vols. Allen & Unwin. 65s.

This is sponsored by the Ministry of Education of the Government of India under an editorial board with Radhakrishnan as chairman. It is an ambitious venture which has succeeded remarkably well. In just over 1,000 pages outstanding Indian scholars, assisted by a few non-Indians on special subjects, survey and expound the whole of philosophical thought from pre-Vedic days up to the age of Existentialism and, almost literally, "from China to Peru". Nor is it at all scrappy, as it might well be with so huge a subject and so many contributors. In an able Introduction, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad defines what is meant by philosophy. "Philosophy is an enquiry into the nature of life and of existence. We have two ways of dealing with reality. One starts and ends with revelation and tradition: we call it religion. The second depends on the free exercise of reason and thought, and is called philosophy". In the sphere of philosophy, as in other spheres, we have to realize that the separation of East and West is artificial. Nothing but a world study of philosophy is today adequate. The West has no monopoly in the free exercise of reason and thought. The remarkable ability of Indian thinkers is made clear by the series of articles, not only on Indian thought through the ages, but by their grasp of modern Western thought in Evolutionism, Logical Positivism and Existentialism. Each volume is beautifully produced and has an adequate index. Unquestionably a book every student of philosophy should have on his shelf.

H. V. MARTIN.

Bridge to Islam. By ERICH W. BETHMANN. 240 pp. Allen & Unwin. 15s.

This is a study of the religous forces of Islam and Christianity in the Near East by one who has spent 20 years in these countries as a Christian missionary. It is an invaluable, up-to-date book for all who are interested in the Near East and its problems, and especially for those going out for the first time. The first half of the book deals concisely with the life and message of Muhammad, with interesting sidelights on the way in which Muhammad is pictured by Muslims today. The fundamental tenets of Islam are then clearly given, obviously by one who has gone to great pains

to put himself inside the minds of the people and see the religion as they see it. Various chapters deal with the place of Jesus in Islam, the problem of religious tolerance, and the inter-relationship of Islam and Christianity. Then follows in the second half an account of the modern situation in the various Near East countries, touching especially on the nature of possible Christian missionary work in each. Many parts of the Near East are still largely forbidden territory for Christian evangelism; but in other parts prejudice is slowly breaking down and schools and hospitals have been opened. It is a pity that the scope of the book does not include India and Pakistan, where the building of a Bridge to Islam seems more possible than in most of the Near East. With his deep understanding of modern Islam the author also reveals his firm Christian convictions. A useful and full Bibliography, a satisfactory Index, and End Maps are provided.

H. V. MARTIN.

The Holy Koran: an introduction with selections. By A. J. ARBERRY. 141 pp. Allen & Unwin. 8s. 6d.

This work is No. 9 in the series *Ethical and Religious Classics of East and West*. The avowed and probably worthy object of that series is to gather the treasures of all faiths and present them to the intelligent reader. That being understood, Prof. Arberry has done his task fairly and well. There is a good introduction, which says much about the Koran and little about Mohammed; then follow the translated selections. These are arranged in logical order, and certainly present "the best of the Koran". The translation is excellently done, both from the view of scholarship and of English style. It is good to be made to realize how much true spirituality there is in the Koran—and interesting to recognize how much of it came from Judaism and Christianity. But the reader who may be led to undue adulation of Islam would do well, before making his final conclusion, to read the life of the Prophet and some of the less spiritual parts of the Koran. It is not to be inferred that Prof. Arberry is a Muslim or a near-Muslim. He has simply carried out a specific task with sympathy and scholarship. I am glad that he writes *Muslim* rather than *Moslem*, and wish he had also written *Muhammad* and *Quran*.

A. R. VINE.

The Archaeology of World Religions. By JACK FINEGAN. 599 pp. Princeton University Press (London: Geoffrey Cumberlege). 63s.

This work is typical of the best contemporary American scholarship. Ample resources in skilled clerical assistance, in travel facilities and in technical process have been drawn upon to produce a really notable volume. As the title indicates, concern is with origins and records rather than with present practice; but the chosen ground has been thoroughly and carefully covered and it would be difficult indeed to find a comparable single-volume source book. The first section deals with primitive man and origins of religion, and then follow nine sections dealing with the great world religions: Zoroastrianism, Hinduism, Jainism, Buddhism, Confucianism, Taoism, Shinto, Islam and Sikhism. In each case the general and religious background is adequately sketched in, the life and work of the original leader is dealt with, and the significance of literary and other remains is analysed. Extensive and careful research has gone to the making of this book, and a special feature is photographic illustration. There are no less than 260 excellently reproduced photographs, a large proportion being full-page.

So far as I am competent to check it, the book seems factually accurate. A difficulty with oriental names arises from actual differences of form aggravated by differences in systems of transliteration. The same name is sometimes quoted in different forms, and some readers might not easily

identify them. What is done for Zoroaster on p. 75 and for Confucius on p. 343 might well have been done in a number of other cases. The treatment is factual and the author expresses few opinions. I can only suppose that the statement on p. 46, "there is little doubt that *benge* possesses a supernatural dynamism", means "there is little doubt that *benge* is supposed to possess a supernatural dynamism". But these are very minor criticisms of an excellent work. It should be added that the Hebrew and Christian religions are not dealt with in this work, as they are similarly treated in the author's *Light from the Ancient Past*. A. R. VINE.

The Moral Nature of Man. By A. CAMPBELL GARNETT. 278 pp. Ronald Press, N.Y. $3.75.

The study of human nature is such a wide and far-reaching subject that no one can span all the disciplines that are relevant to it. This study by the Professor of Philosophy in the University of Wisconsin is a particularly lucid exposition of ethical principles, steering a middle course between naturalistic ethics and a paradoxical hopelessness before sinful depravity.

The theologian who reads this book should begin from a grateful acknowledgment that Professor Garnett is defending positions which are of great theological importance against the keen and incisive attacks of some of his philosophical colleagues, and should give a respectful hearing to his claim that stress on the inevitability of sin undermines essential moral conviction. But the theologian need not go so far in his gratitude as to overlook the fact that Professor Garnett has, perhaps, still something to learn about the theology of the moral life. He binds religion more closely to the moral impulse than seems warranted by the history of religion; in his treatment of revelation he does not go beyond the limitations of Kant; and he seems almost entirely blind to the ultimate problem of the relation between moral conduct and redemption. Nevertheless, as a lucid and illuminating statement of an ethical position, which, taken broadly, is entirely compatible with Christian faith, the book deserves a real welcome.

H. CUNLIFFE-JONES.

Contrast Psychology. By MURDO MACKENZIE. 305 pp. Allen & Unwin. 21s.

Contrast Psychology deals with four manifestations of Spirit at the level of inter-human contact. These are Immediate and Deliberate Simplification and Immediate and Deliberate Amplification. Amplification means that the Spirit is manifesting itself through ritual and fixed symbolism; Simplification means its direct access to an object, expressing its infinite concepts in apposite analogy. Immediacy is concerned with the here and now, whereas Deliberation views every situation in terms of the past and future. These four different manifestations explain why individuals, nations, and even mentally ill patients present a method of expression which is not easily understood or accepted by others. "The tragedy of life lies in the fact of contrast, since the power of expression which links him to his fellows is also doomed to bring him into conflict with his fellows." The Romans found it difficult to appreciate the Simplification of the Greeks because of their Amplification. The Immediate Simplification of the Church Reformers conflicted with the Deliberate Amplification of the Papacy. Napoleon utilized the Immediate Simplification of Rousseau until such time as he could express his Immediate Amplification. This book will only be appreciated by those who are prepared to study it carefully.

W. E. SARGENT.

Conflict and Light. Edited by PERE BRUNO. 192 pp. Sheed & Ward. 10s. 6d.

Outside the Roman Catholic Faith few could subscribe to the orthodox views presented in the first two chapters, but many will find considerable help in the rest of the book. Dr. Francoise Dolto has some pertinent things to say about "How children acquire a False Sense of Guilt". She writes from her clinical experience as a child psychiatrist and in a manner that gives a true human understanding of the true nature of guilt, which is sometimes overlooked. Another helpful chapter is that by Rudolph Allers, who deals with "Some Psychological Aspects of Confession". He clarifies the difference between the Confessional and the Consulting-room. Confession is concerned with the relation of the penitent to God; "in the Consulting-room it is the man himself and his troubles". Dr. Cossa's chapter on "Guilty Conscience and Mental Troubles" and its criticism by Charles Henri Nodet are indeed valuable. The second part of the book, "Balance and Light", contains a clear psychological exposition by Charles Baudouin of "Angelism and False Transcendence". His analysis reveals the narcissistic element underlying such cases. W. E. SARGENT.

Challenge of the Unknown. By LOUIS K. ANSPACHER. 324 pp. Allen & Unwin. 16s.

The title of this book might well have been "A Challenge to the Sceptic", for the author presents material which cannot be interpreted on purely cognitive grounds. He cites the remarkable fact of the Elberfeld horses that solved mathematical problems, a phenomenon that baffled even the experts. But Dr. Anspacher not only deals with the phenomenal happenings within the world, he also gives careful consideration to psychic experiences in the realm of telepathy and of the spiritual world. For those who are interested in the pivotal work of Dr. Rhine in extra sensory perception a great deal of information is to be found in this work. The reader will also find a brave effort to maintain that psychical research is a modern science, though it is doubtful whether we can speak of it in the sense we do of physics. Nevertheless the author is convinced that "Psychical Research is providing a new faith in the existence of an unseen and transcendent universe", and, whilst not concerned with the divinity of Jesus, he claims that "Christianity is a religion founded on Psychic and Spiritistic manifestations". St. Paul's "dramatic experience on the road to Damascus was not an epileptic but a psychic seizure". The book is abounding with interesting records of psychic activity in the supersensual world manifesting itself "through unanticipated, unpredictable channels" having "very little relation to the character, education, or mentality of the medium himself". To be enjoyed it must be perused without prejudice, and the reader can then form his own assessment of its contribution to knowledge. W. E. SARGENT.

Ezekiel and Alexander, by L. E. Browne (34 pp., S.P.C.K., 3s. 6d.), is a closely-reasoned essay by the Emeritus Professor of Theology at Leeds, in which he argues for the unity of Ezekiel and dates it in the times of Alexander the Great.

The Spirit of God in the Synoptic Gospels, by I. W. Batdorf (8 pp., Princeton Pamphlet Series, price not stated), outlines the beginnings of the New Testament doctrine of the Holy Spirit.

The Free Churches and the State, by E. A. Payne (29 pp., Carey Kingsgate Press and Independent Press, 9d.), is the lecture delivered by Dr. Payne to the Congregational Union Assembly in May, 1952. It sets out the historic Free Church witness on relationship with the State, and relates historic principle to present problems.

RELIGION

LIFE AND WORK

The Four Gospels. A new translation by E. V. Rieu. Penguin Classics. 2s. 6d.

Numerous new translations of either the whole or a part of the Bible have appeared recently; and among them Dr. Rieu's takes a place of special interest. Not only is it the most available, being on view almost everywhere and priced at only half-a-crown, but the translator is well known as having produced distinguished versions of the *Odyssey* and *Iliad*. Moreover, it is not so common to have the Gospels translated by one who is not a professional N.T. scholar.

One has to live with a translation of the Gospels to be able to appraise its worth justly; and any comment after a first careful reading of it must be understood with that qualification, since points of detail which escape the eye to begin with may appear on further inspection. Nevertheless, it may be said at once that one's first impression is of an accurate and graceful rendering into dignified (but by no means stilted) modern English. At times, as in the Prologue to the Fourth Gospel, it rises to great heights. The whole appearance of the book is modern even to the point of footnotes, wherein appear such explanatory verses as begin "that it might be fulfilled . . . ." and "which is, being interpreted . . . ."; and the opening verses of Luke appear in italics as a sort of preface.

Much interest will centre in the lively and fresh Introduction, which records Dr. Rieu's reasons for undertaking the work and some of his reflections on the Gospels themselves. It is interesting, for example, to read of his (somewhat unexpectedly reached) conviction that the Four Gospels are "great literature" and possess a "beauty that is all their own": here he dissents strongly from the views of C. S. Lewis and J. B. Phillips. Moreover, he has some striking things to say about the Authorized Version, which he esteems as beautiful, though its beauty is not the same as that of the Evangelists' own work; and he holds the view that the language of the A.V. was "already old-fashioned when it was written." It is obvious that Dr. Rieu has read widely and deeply much of the literature about Gospel origins in particular and N.T. studies as a whole; and some of his comments are most apt and original: e.g. "as a preliminary to the study of the Gospels too large a dose of Form-criticism might well reduce one to the condition of a man who stands before a Raphael and keeps on asking where the artist got his paints!" Nor will any who read it soon forget the account of the impression of Jesus which close attention to the Gospels left on Dr. Rieu's mind.

Not all Dr. Rieu's judgments will command universal assent; but there will surely be a most widespread hope that he will produce a substantial work on the Gospels, for not only has he the material obviously well on hand, but (and how rare this is!) an original mind, untrammelled by all the assumptions of the professional; and all will be grateful that, if the Four Gospels are to appear as a popular best-seller, the work of translating them for this purpose was entrusted to someone so competent and reverent.

John Huxtable.

How to Know Your Bible. A. Victor Murray. 191 pp. Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

In this handsomely produced volume the President of Cheshunt College, Cambridge, seeks to provide help in Bible-study for ordinary lay people who are willing to take a little time and trouble to know their Bible; and there is no doubt at all that such folk will greatly profit by what Mr. Murray gives them. He follows an original method: after a brief discussion of the Bible in its English, Greek and Hebrew versions, nine representative books of the Bible, taken in the chronological order of their writing, are looked at in some detail; then, in parts III and IV, the Old and New Testament books are gone over in a more general way. The general effect is that the reader who follows this outline with a Revised Version in his other hand will receive a good general impression of what each book is about and of the place it has in the biblical history. But he will really need another book to complete what he learns from Mr. Murray, who writes from the standpoint of the typical liberal-Protestant, without apparently realizing how much water has flowed under the bridges since that outlook was "the thing." No one would gather from these pages what is the inner unity of the Bible; there is no indication how to use the Old Testament as Christian Scripture; nor is there any treatment of the great themes which dominate both Testaments (e.g. salvation, the people of God, etc.): but without some profound instruction in these very matters the ordinary layman cannot handle the Bible with assurance. J. H.

Why I Believe John Foster and others. 55 pp. Epworth Press. 5s.

This book consists of eight chapters which were originally broadcast talks in the Scottish Home Service. John Baillie, John White and George Macleod are among the contributors. Each talk is a personal testimony; and all are of a very high order. The one which fascinated the reviewer most is the last, by Katherine Trevelyan, a niece of the famous Cambridge historian, who lived in Hitlerite Germany for a number of years, during which time came the experience of conversion. Ministers will find this book a useful reminder of the variety of religious experience; and if they can get their youth groups to discuss it with them, it might well be that a good many "fringers" would become believers. J. H.

The Faith We Preach. E. C. Blackman. 139 pp. Independent Press. 8s. 6d.

The author has written exposition of the things most surely believed with a view to helping Lay Preachers; in this he has succeeded admirably. If Lay Preachers read and digest this kind of book, our Churches will be increasingly glad of their help. At the same time, many who are not Lay Preachers will benefit from the scholarly yet not 'academic' material Mr. Blackman provides. The ground he covers is sufficiently indicated by the chapter-headings: God and his Sovereignty, Man and his need, Christ and his succour, Christ and his society. Christ and his book. It is with the last chapter that some difficulty is likely to arise; and this will probably be because the author has tried to pack too much into the last pages of his book. He seeks to bring those who have accepted the so-called assured results of modern biblical scholarship to an understanding of the unity of the Bible and its theological importance—issues with which biblical scholars are now mainly concerned. Mr. Blackman should give us another book in which the issues raised in the last chapter are treated more spaciously.

J. H.

Meet the Greek Testament. ADAM FOX. 128 pp. S.C.M. 8s. 6d.

The Archdeacon of Westminster has produced a most unusual and charming book. It consists of two essays and a dialogue "for those who have little or no Greek." The two essays are on the transmission and interpretation of the N.T., and provide a good popular account of such matters as the manuscripts, words, style, authorship, dates, and so forth. The dialogue, which occupies about half of the book, is an admirable piece in the platonic manner: the subject-matter is a discussion of such important words as 'world,' 'word,' 'adoption' and 'Saviour,' to mention but a few, all to disclose what meaning these words have in the N.T. A great deal of much-needed information is very palatably conveyed to the reader; and the lay person who wants to learn how to handle the N.T. more intelligently will find this a most rewarding volume.

The main criticism which must be levelled against the book as a whole is that its outlook on N.T. scholarship is somewhat dated. Canon Fox expresses his debt to Westcott and Hort and to Sanday and Headlam. None of us is out of the debt, nor are likely to be; but in subsequent years we have become debtors to others no less. These munificent contributions to learning Fox seems to ignore. He still thinks of the Bible as a Greek rather than a Semitic book. For example, had he made use of C. H. Dodd's re-orientation of N.T. studies, his account of 'justification' would have been truer to fact and less unfair to Protestants. Nevertheless, the book represents non-party Anglican scholarship at its most genial best; and that is to say a great deal! J. H.

Junior Bible Archaeology. H. V. MORSLEY. 104 pp. Epworth Press. 6s. 6d.

This book is intended for the use of children in Secondary Schools and for those who "take R.I." therein. It aims to give a popular account of the discoveries of Woolley, Garstang and Petrie; it describes their methods; it gives much interesting information about domestic life in the ancient cities of Sumer, Egypt, and Canaan; and it describes cunieform and hieroglyphic writing. The author has well adjusted his material to his audience—but if only these archaeologists could be persuaded that their evidence cannot by its very nature lead to such precise conclusions! J. H.

A More Excellent Way. By LESLIE J. TIZARD. 141 pp. Independent Press. 7s. 6d.

There can be no doubt that Mr. Tizard's wise and penetrating book will be of enormous help to a great many. He expounds I Cor. xiii (Moffatt's version) not theologically, but with the kind of shrewd and kindly psychological insight we have learned to expect from him. He enumerates and describes various aspects of Love, and devastatingly displays our failures. If such a book does not move us to penitence, it is hard to conceive what will. For all this we are more than grateful; but our gratitude would have been even greater if the mixture had been somewhat less purgative and at the same time more nourishing. This is indeed the Christian *Law;* but what of the Gospel? In the last chapter Mr. Tizard indicates plainly enough that Love is a gift rather than an achievement; but, even so, we are left wondering how the fruits of the Spirit can be grown apart from the evangelical experience of the grace of God in Jesus Christ. Mr. Tizard has really raised the question: how can I live a Christian life? He has described the ideal admirably; and he has discerned our shortcoming only too well; would that he could give us more help to make up what is lacking. J. H.

One Christ, One World, One Church. By NORMAN VICTOR HOPE. 96 pp. Church Historical Society, Philadelphia. $1.00.

This is a "short introduction to the Ecumenical Movement"; and it is excellently done. Professor Hope has provided a reliable picture of the development of the "great new fact of our time" within the sort of compass which will not daunt the layman; and those who wish to commend the Ecumenical Movement to the rank and file of our Churches will not require anything more suitable than this. Here is set forth the story of the growing together of Christ's people from 1910 onwards; and this most significant event in Church History ought to be as widely known as possible. Professor Hope has met a real need; and it is a pleasure to commend his book and to wish for it the widest possible circulation. J. H.

The Life of the Bible. By E. SUTHERLAND BATES. 160 pp. Andre Deutsch. 8s. 6d.

The author of this rather unusual book is best known as the editor of "The Bible designed to be read as literature." The book was first published in America in 1937, and has since been revised for its appearance in England by Mr. C. F. Davey, who has revised some of its author's judgments in the light of recent archaeology. The general point of view is the now somewhat old-fashioned "modern" outlook on the Bible, which is understood as literature rather than as Scripture; and it is hard to say precisely to what *genre* the book belongs: part of it is a discussion of the biblical authors; and the rest of it seems rather like a lightning tour of Church History, taking particular note of various attitudes to the Bible *en passant*. Still, there is a good deal of useful information here, pleasantly set out in a very readable form. J. H.

The Belief of Catholics. By RONALD KNOX. 214 pp. Sheed and Ward. 10s. 6d.

Why I Am Not a Roman Catholic. By KENNETH N. ROSS. 126 pp. Mowbrays. 7s. 6d.

There can be no more charming or engaging pugilist than Mgr. Knox, who now re-issues a book which was first published in 1927. There are a few revisions, made, one gathers, because Protestant controversialists have seen fit to misrepresent certain portions of the original edition. It is conceivable, of course, that some of his readers may look upon this complaint as an instance of the pot calling the kettle black, for there is no convincing evidence that Mgr. Knox has really tried to be fair to Protestantism. Nevertheless, it should be said ungrudgingly that this is a brilliant piece of apologetic. Its style is a model of easy and graceful clarity; and the argument is tellingly shaped. It is a book to be reckoned with; but at the same time, it is just a bit too clever, and reminds one more of a barrister's special pleading than a theologian's presentation of truth. Our Protestant witness, however, would be greatly strengthened if we worked through these pages, noting the "wrong" turns of the argument, and seeking to discover the "right" reply.

Fr. Ross's book seems a trifle pedestrian alongside Mgr. Knox's; but this should not blind us to its great merits. It is not to be expected that the Vicar of All Saints', Margaret Street, would write anything likely to be entirely in accord with the views of the National Union of Protestants; yet much of what he says about the assumption of the Virgin Mary and of the infallibility of the Pope will be grist to any non-papist mill. It is shrewd and devastating, and somehow all the more effective for being said by one

who in so many other respects shares 'catholic' assumptions. What Fr. Ross has to say about papal views of Anglican Orders may give to some Dissenters the wicked pleasure of seeing an Anglican having a dose of his own medicine. While the author's background is very different from our own, this learned little book is one from which we may gain a great deal.

JOHN HUXTABLE.

The Fibres of Faith. By A. NORMAN ROWLAND. 236 pp. Independent Press. 10s. 6d.

Mr. Rowland offers two extended essays, one called *The Logic of Nature* and the other *The Language of Miracle,* prefaced by his article from this journal for April 1941 on *The Tension between Religion and Science* whose journalistic flavour tends to belie the quality of what follows. The first of the two major essays contains the statement of a philosophy of life drawn from "the Book of Science" and from "the Testament of Poetry." Mr. Rowland invites us to proceed from the obvious and promising features of human experience and to "read between the lines" until we view the world "not merely as a causal creation but as a radiant cosmos" and see how "the laws of scientific invisibilities are translated creatively into the realm of spiritual meaning and worth." In this essay the high-minded Idealism of Balliol under Sir Edward Caird receives a welcome if somewhat unexpected prolongation into the contemporary world of thought. The argument moves in a climate unclouded by the clinical austerities of modern philosophy and shows a robust confidence in our ability to "look over the head of the scientific approach to the view we have been missing." The view seems to me an anodyne rather than a medicine for modern man in his cultural and moral dilemma, but I am sure that Mr. Rowland has done us a service by opening to us the treasures of his own experience and reflection. The second essay interprets the tradition of the miracles in the Synoptic Gospels as "the radiation of a personality who could carry to perfection the *erga* of God." "It was addressed to people who could only be reached through their own aura of superstition. To all such—and they are the bulk of the world's people even today—it carried a message that there was a Master still available, who could meet the problems of social life by the transformation of values." Mr. Rowland has made a fine attempt to let this tradition carry its message into the world of today, based on careful and imaginative understanding of its original setting.

W. A. WHITEHOUSE.

Changing Strategy in Evangelism. By EDGAR P. BLAMIRES. 90 pp. Epworth Press. 5s.

The fact that Mr. Blamires writes with special reference to the Methodist Connexion must not be made an excuse for failure to participate in his provocative study. Setting aside evangelism as a specialized activity, he regards it as expressing the total life of the Church. His practical suggestions involve both the attachment of whole families to Christ, and a complete reorientation of Church life, so that at every stage of development, from childhood to maturity, each person is nurtured and trained in the Christian way.

CONRAD BONIFAZI.

Essential Christianity. By W. E. WILSON. 147 pp. Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

Mr. Wilson starts from the thesis that some elements in the teaching of the Lord Jesus have been forgotten in the course of time; moreover his teaching has often been almost completely obscured by "a mass of beliefs, practices and regulations, some of them wholly irrelevant to anything he taught, some contrary to it and some right in their place, but not essential."

The world's need and the Church's need is that we return to the pure, if not always wholly simple, teaching of the Master. We have paid far too much attention to intellectual constructions, to institutions and to rites; the Christian faith is a life, not a series of propositions, and Christian unity is not to be achieved by any agreement upon creeds, ministries and sacraments. The exegesis of the Old and New Testaments upon which Mr. Wilson rests his case is careful and persuasive but not always convincing; yet the book is written so gently and so simply and so winningly and so sincerely that it may be very profitably studied by serious Congregationalists; and if by this study a few of them should be beguiled over the line into the Quaker camp, I should be very sorry but, after all, I have known worse catastrophies than that.

N. MICKLEM.

Servant of the Church. By MAXWELL O. JANES. 80 pp. Livingstone Press. 2s. 6d.

This is a masterly achievement. Mr. Janes has set himself to write a popular account of the Policy Report of the L.M.S., and the task could not have been better performed. It is to be hoped that this little book will have an enormous circulation in the Congregational Churches. Is it enough, he asks, that the Church should be defined as constituted by the preaching of the Gospel, the administration of the sacraments and godly discipline? Should there not be a reference to Christian witness? Congregational Churches rest, explicitly or at least implicitly, upon a covenant; should not the church's missionary task be included in the covenant? Mr. Janes pleads a cause and presents an appeal; the reader should not look for a dispassionate and critical appraisal of the missionary situation.

N, MICKLEM.

Christ in Dachau. Edited by P. HASTINGS. 105 pp. Newman Bookshop, Oxford, paper covers. 3s.

The unbeliever viewing the suffering in the world is apt to ask, how can such things be if God is good; the Protestant viewing high Mass in a Roman church is apt to ask, how can such things be, if the participators have considered the New Testament. This unpretentious little book, which contains the testimony of many, mostly Roman Catholics but some Protestants also, answers both these questions. The answers are not speculative but, as it is now called, "existential." Dachau represents hell on earth, the extremity of human suffering, misery and horror. The narratives and letters here cited reveal heaven in Dachau, heaven on earth as it is not to be known by those who have not suffered. Suffering is not meaningless; it is, or it may be, "the royal road of the sacred Cross." In these pages, too, the doctrine of transubstantiation is not vindicated, but we see how the wafer, breviary, the relic are in Dachau as elsewhere vehicles of grace to our fellow-Christians. In the setting of Dachau we can understand. This will be a memorable book to those who read it, and it only costs three shillings.

N. MICKLEM.

For the Quiet Hour by Francis B. James and *After this Manner* by Clement H. Pugsley (Epworth, 7s. 6d. each) will be welcomed by those seeking help for their private devotions. The former, first published in 1937 and now appearing in a new series, contains twenty-five meditations selected by the author from his contributions to the devotional column in the *Methodist Recorder*. The latter consists of thirty-one meditations, one for each day of the month, on the Lord's Prayer. A useful index gives the sources of quotations used.

The New Road from Bethlehem by Philip W. Lilley (Blackie, 8s. 6d.) is a volume of twenty sermons preached in a Scottish country parish church. In these "Studies in Spiritual Reconstruction" Mr. Lilley reveals his gift of making a text live and takes his illustrations and quotations from a wide range of sources. If he sometimes lets his imagination carry him beyond the strict bounds of Biblical exegesis he never leaves us at a loss for suggestions of deep spiritual insight.

More Precious than Rubies by Doris M. Whitney (Independent Press, 6s.) provides a series of devotional services for use at Women's Meetings. It attempts to give leaders of such meetings the kind of help provided for the Sunday School teacher by the Concise Guides. Here are some good stories, helpful prayers and addresses, together with suggested hymns, readings and orders of service. The book could also be used devotionally by those unable to get to the weekly meetings.

Whatever is—is Right? by Ivon Braby (Independent Press, 7s. 6d.) was inspired by and is based on a passage from Pope's "Essay on Man." The author is a scientist and a Christian believer and he discusses a wide range of subjects, such as determination and freewill, the problem of suffering, survival after death. He concludes that Pope was right in affirming that "to meet the real needs of mankind and unfold its noblest possibilities, no better conditions could have been created than those provided for us on this Earth: and on the spiritual plane no statesman or philosopher has been able to sketch a more perfect plan for the eradication of moral evil and the growth of virtue in men of free-will than that prepared in infinite love by the supreme wisdom of God."

William J. May's *Human Nature in the Bible* (Epworth, 6s.) is described as "A Modern Commentary on the Old Testament Story." The title may suggest a serious theological treatise: in fact this book is a re-telling of familiar Bible stories with an attempt to show how the men and women of whom we read in the Old Testament faced the same problems and possessed the same human nature that are ours today. JAMES M. TODD.

To attempt to discuss *"The Church and the Artisan"* by Roger Lloyd (Longmans, paper, 4s. 6d.) in a few lines is unjust. The claim of the book to be discussing "the most urgent of all the Church's many problems" is justified, for it was said at Amsterdam in 1948 that the three great areas into which the Gospel was failing to penetrate were Hinduism, Islam and "urban and industrial man in the great cities". This latter field is on our doorsteps and we have to tackle it. There is no need to agree with all this Anglican writer's diagnosis or suggested treatment. This *is* an important book. It should not be missed.

To his "Life and Person of Jesus Christ" in the series of Christian Discussion Group Pamphlets Prof. H. E. W. Turner has added *"Why We Believe in Jesus Christ"* (S.P.C.K., paper, 2s. 6d.). Here are eight compressed studies which, worked through and mastered, will greatly enrich faith. The Biblical material is fully treated and there are particularly helpful discussions of the Miracles and the Resurrection. It is a matter of regret to have to point out that there are three misquotations, more than a dozen misprints and the transformation of Dr. Hunter's "The Work and Words of Jesus" into "The Words and Work of Christ".

Alfred Duggan's *"Thomas Becket of Canterbury"* (Faber & Faber, 12s. 6d.) is first class. The man Thomas Becket comes alive, and he thinks and speaks, eats and rides, swaggers and wavers in a real world, and so does Henry his royal friend and foe. Alfred Duggan unravels the knotty motives of a faraway time with a patience, sureness and sly humour that

are captivating. His book is a remarkable introduction to a man and his age, to a national and international scene of the utmost importance for all who would understand the Middle Ages.

"The Doctor" by Barclay Baron (Arnold & Co., 16s.) is the biography of John Stansfield, who founded the Bermondsey Medical Mission, the precursor of the Oxford and Bermondsey Club. A Civil Servant, born in 1854, who graduated in Arts and Medicine in his spare time, who took Orders at the age of 55, went out to Africa as a medical missionary at the age of 72, and lived to welcome evacuees to his parish on the outbreak of the Second World War—this was a life worth writing. It has been exceedingly well written, and the story will interest and challenge a wide circle of readers.

The prolific Enid Blyton has concentrated her magazine work into the fortnightly issue of *Enid Blyton's Magazine* (Evans Bros. Ltd., 4d. per copy). Children of 4-10 years of age want the mixture as before. Here they have it in generous measure, 48 pages of jolly fun, competitions, nature lore, clubs, kindness to animals and sympathy toward the afflicted. In congratulating the writer one must add a word in praise of the clever illustrations.

A fine tale of missionary pioneering in mid-Celebes is presented in *Leonard Goes East* by Albert Kenyon (Salvationist Press, 4s.). It is a modern story, opening during the first World War and continuing until after the end of the Second. It would make a good prize for a lad of 12-14.

The very title of Cecil Hunt's *Uncommon Prayers for Younger People* (Hodder & Stoughton, 6s.) raises a question. Do young people need or like uncommon prayers? Does anyone easily pray in archaic, ultra-modern or quaintly poetic diction? In fact, this is not so much a book of prayers as an anthology in which classics and atrocities stand side by side. Some blemishes are hard to understand. *"Son* of Righteousness" (p. 53) is either a misprint or a howler. "God, Who *has* made . . . ." (p. 56) is ungrammatical. The contributor T. T. twice offends (pp. 70 and 80) by confusing second singular and second plural in the same sentence: "Thank *you* God for *Thy* lovely day." And I defy anyone, however young, to begin a prayer, "Dear God, the French have a proverb . . . ." (p. 46). Only dear old Vernon Bartlet could have done that!

We now have Volume Five of The Teachers' Guides to Religious Education, *The King and His Service* by Ernest Hayes and F. S. Popham (Religious Education Press, 7s.). This is a volume of Junior Lessons on the Agreed Syllabuses, and anyone teaching Scripture in a Junior Day School or teaching in the Junior Department of a Sunday School is well advised to secure this book. The scheme, in outline, is to give a course of lessons on "Our Lord, the King's Son," a course on "The Spread of the Kingdom" in ancient and in modern times, and then to look back to the prophets as "Forerunners of the Kingdom." The material provided is ample, accurate and vivid.

Another book of great value to teachers is *Infants Teacher's Handbook to the Agreed Syllabuses* (R.E.P., 5s.) by Dr. Basil A. Yeaxlee. This is a first-class book by an acknowledged expert in religious education. It is not a book of lessons so much as a book on how to teach. There are valuable discussions, for example, on how to present the Birth Stories or the Miracles to small children. For the Bible sections there are very helpful notes, making this a book of reference which will enrich the teacher's own understanding. All beginners and Primary Leaders ought to get this book and to use it.

JOHN WILDING.

The Times of Jesus Christ, by A. G. Knott (Fellowship of Reconciliation, 9d.), is the fifth edition of a pamphlet first issued in 1941. It is a useful factual summary of the economy and politics of Palestine under Roman rule, the subsidiary theme being the argument that Christ's reaction was the way of pacifism.

First Called Christians: A Study in Names, by Gustave Isely (Salvationist Publishing and Supplies, 4s. 6d.), ranges over the whole realm of Christian history. It contains much useful and interesting information, the string of connection being the names that Christians have called themselves or have been called. Many people who would not face reading a book of Church History would find this as diverting as a novel, and would rise from its 122 pages considerably informed.

Prayers of Faith and Fellowship is an official Unitarian publication, issued by the Lindsey Press at 6s. It contains a selection of prayers, new and old, for the use of Unitarians and Free Christians. But others will also find them of value in helping their thoughts before prayer, and many of them only need some such addition as "And this we ask for Jesus Christ's sake" to make them fully acceptable in any evangelical service.

In *Hubert W. Peet* Winifred M. White tells the story of a great modern Quaker (Friends Home Service Committee, 1s. 3d.). He was editor of *The Friend* from 1932 to 1949, and exerted a quiet but very real influence within the Society.

At a Door, by R. K. Walker (Epworth, 9d.), gives useful guidance on the technique of house-to-house evangelism.

Christ's Message for To-Day, by McEwan Lawson (James Clarke, 1s.), is the first "Harry Bulcock Memorial Lecture" of the Union of Modern Free Churchmen.

Preparation for Christian Healing, by W. H. Bourne (Epworth, 2s. 6d.), contains much practical wisdom, even if some of us do not go all the way in the claims or aims of the Christian Healing Prayer Intercessors.

MISCELLANEA

Elizabeth Our Queen. By RICHARD DIMBLEBY. 188 pp. Hodder & Stoughton. 12s. 6d.

Royalty bears with good grace the never ceasing interest of its subjects, and knows that every action will be observed with attentive concern. No incident in royal life, however trivial, escapes notice. The books about the Royal Family must be almost numberless, even if articles in the weekly journals are left out of account.

But Mr. Dimbleby's work comes into a higher category than most, and deserves commendation. He records the main facts in the life of our Queen, relating anecdotes of interest without descending to trivialities, and gives a clear picture of her growing character and sense of vocation. Interlaced with the biography—and avowedly one of the purposes—is a most useful account of training for the throne and a detailed explanation of the duties and practice of constitutional monarchy. The book is a mine of information, making clear the valuable functions devolving upon the Crown both in Great Britain and the Commonwealth, and giving assurance that those functions will be effectively fulfilled by our young but earnestly responsible Queen.

The Observer's Book of Music. By FREDA DINN. 190 pp. Warne & Co. 5s.

This is an admirable little book for the ordinary person who wants concise information on musical matters. It is divided into four parts. Part I deals with the physical basis of music—vibrations and sound waves. Part II gives a most interesting descriptive survey of musical instruments of all kinds, ancient and modern, from the dulcimer to the electronic organ. Part III is a dictionary of musical terms. Part IV contains brief biographies of the great composers. The book contains a mass of information, and has been carefully edited. We would only note that Gounod died in 1893, not 1983 (p. 164); that the Christian name of Strauss is Richard (p. 178); and that Johann Sebastian Bach is to be preferred to John Sebastian Bach (p. 153). But these are only minor blemishes on an excellent little book, made the more attractive by numerous illustrations in the text. A. R. V.

Akbar's Religious Thought Reflected in Mogul Painting. By EMMY NELLESZ. 47 pp. with 40 plates. Allen and Unwin. 12s. 6d.

This volume is No. 7 in the series known as "Ethical and Religious Classics of East and West." The letterpress consists of two essays, the first on Akbar and his search for ultimate truth; the second, of a somewhat technical kind, on Akbar as patron of the arts. The half tone illustrations, which vary somewhat in clarity, afford a lively sense of the exquisite work which was achieved in India at the instigation of this most remarkable warrior and philosopher emperor who sought to blend the traditions of Persian, Hindu and Islamic art, and who was himself a notable figure in the spiritual and religious history of mankind. Authoress, editors and publisher are to be much commended for a beautifully produced book which will bring pleasure and illumination to any whose interests are along these lines. N. MICKLEM.

An Approach to Measuring Results in Social Work. By DAVID G. FRENCH. 172 pp. Columbia University Press (London: Geoffrey Cumberlege). 20s.

This is a very clear statement, on a fairly elementary level, of the principles which should aid research workers in the various fields of social welfare activities. It should be especially interesting to psychiatric social workers, health visitors, and those responsible for administering social welfare programmes of one kind or another. The principles stated have a fairly general application, and the book would be useful to ministers who are interested in social science and wish to make social surveys within their own areas. A scientific approach to pastoral problems is not to be overlooked. Chapter IV, "The Logic of Evaluative Research," is particularly helpful in this respect. The statistics relating to the amount of money expended on social welfare in the U.S.A. are agreeably surprising. "Social work is big business," according to French (p. 12), who states that 125 million dollars are spent annually by the state of Michigan alone—about 80 per cent of it for financial assistance to the aged, the blind, the handicapped, dependent children and so on. 85 per cent of this amount comes from taxes. In the appendix four evaluative studies are analysed by academic experts: one on community services in a housing project, one on family casework services, a third on projects for the prevention of juvenile delinquency, and a fourth on the prediction of juvenile delinquency.

W. E. SARGENT.

Roads to Agreement. By STUART CHASE. 250 pp. Phoenix House. 18s.

Mr. Stuart Chase is one of the best-known of American writers on the social sciences. The sub-title of his latest book accurately describes its contents: it is a study of "successful methods in the science of human relations". He first identifies eighteen levels of conflict, from family quarrels to the 'cold' war between East and West, and then propounds five principles of agreement ('participation', 'group energy', 'clearing communication lines', 'facts first' and 'the feeling of security') which, scientifically studied and applied in practice, may help to reduce conflict throughout the world. Mr. Chase is not specifically concerned with religion, but of all the existing methods whereby a group of people may reach agreement on a controversial issue it is that of the Quaker meeting which seems most deeply to have impressed him.

In spite of the many unpleasant facts which he so resolutely faces Mr. Chase remains an optimist. He writes with verve and point, and shuns abstraction. Frankly popular in its appeal, his book should eliminate much prejudice and help many people to clarify their thinking.

P. A. SPALDING.

George Hogben: A Biography. By HERBERT ROTH. 162 pp. New Zealand Council for Educational Research. (London: Geoffrey Cumberlege.) 18s. 6d.

George Hogben (1853-1920), who came of old Kentish Congregational stock and was himself a prominent Congregationalist in the country of his adoption, was successively second master at Christchurch High School, headmaster of Timaru High School, Inspector-General of Schools, and Director of Education in New Zealand. Mr. Roth's concise biography is concerned rather with Hogben's personal life than with his life-work as an educational reformer. He was a man of many interests. In *Who's Who* he gave his recreations as "bowling, seismology, and proportional represen-

tation." To these may be added mathematics and Buddhism, on which he was fond of lecturing, even to unsympathetic audiences. Yet, in the words of his biographer, "he never seemed to find time to enjoy life." "Get the best teacher you can, and when you have got him, leave him alone," was Hogben's own statement of his educational creed. To his inability to follow his own advice and leave well alone, we may—at least in part—attribute both his success in helping others and his relative failure to find happiness for himself.

Mr. Roth provides a bibliography of Hogben's writings, five portraits (one of which, without its caption, might be mistaken for a characteristic photograph of Bernard Shaw), and a detailed Index. P. A. SPALDING.

As in the previous volumes of the *New Oxford Illustrated Dickens,* all the plates in *Great Expectations* (O.U.P., 10s. 6d.) have been re-made from the original drawings. In addition to the 21 illustrations by F. W. Pailthorpe, there is a brief Introduction by Mr. Frederick Page. In response to the urgent pleading of Bulwer Lytton, Dickens altered the end of this novel so that Pip and Estella are at last united. The original rejected ending is printed in an appendix to the present edition. P. A. S.

Public Opinion on the Prague Trial (38 pp., American Zionist Council, New York, U.S.A., price not stated) assembles the comments of leading American and British newspapers and journals on the Prague trial of November 1952. This is a pamphlet of great value to all who wish to be well informed.

African Opportunity by Lord Milverton (United Central Africa Association, London, 1s.), gives information and informed opinion on the problems of the Rhodesias and Nyasaland. Lord Milverton has spent half a lifetime in colonial administration, and writes with knowledge on the problems of mixed race areas.

Contributions of Science to Peace, by C. A. Coulson (Fellowship of Reconciliation, 1s. 6d.), is the Alex Wood Memorial Lecture for 1953. Prof. Coulson shows how scientific knowledge, responsibly applied, could eliminate many of the causes of war.

PERIODICAL PUBLICATIONS

Hibbert Journal (April). 'Can a Religious Philosophy be Scientific' by Prof. N. O. Lossky: 'Is there a Metaphysic of History?' by Dr. Emile de Groot: 'Marxism and Religion' by Prof. H. B. Mayo: 'Schweitzer and Radhakrishnan' by C. W. M. Gell are all good, with interesting articles on 'The Influence of Religion on the Progress of Medicine' by Dr. F. B. Julian: 'The Snowball of Sin' by W. J. Rutherford, and 'Truth in the Inward Parts' by Dr. C. J. Wright.

International Review of Missions (April). 'The Sending of the Missionary' by Rev. William Stewart and 'The Light of History on Current Missionary Methods' by Prof. Latourette are valuable on the resent dominant missionary concern: 'The Christian Church in Non-Communist Asia' by Prof. Hendrik Graemer and 'The Arab World and the Christian Debt' by Dr. Kenneth Cragg are also timely, as is 'Missions of the Dutch Reformed Church in South Africa' by Dr. H. T. Gonin. 'The Place of the Bible in Evangelism' by Rev. W. J. Platt and 'The Place of the Bible in the Church' by Prin. C. E. Abraham are good. Some of the reviews are helpful to students of China.

The London Quarterly and Holborn Review (April) includes 'Science and Religion' by Prof. C. A. Coulson: 'Jesus as Teacher' by Dr. A. D. Belden: 'Report on China' by Rev. Elliot Kendall: 'Communism: the New Islam' by Rev. D. R. Davies: 'The Basis of the Moral Factor in Education' by Rev. G. Thompson Brake.

Church Quarterly Review (Jan.-March). H. E. W. Turner in 'After Lund' writes helpfully on reunion from the Anglo-Catholic side: S. H. Cooke on 'Patterns in the Gospel' and Cecil S. Emden on 'St. Mark's Debt to St. Peter'. (April-June). The Editor discusses recent aspects of reunion: Rev. G. Lacey May writes on 'Religious Letters of Dr. Johnson': K. G. Collier on 'The Intellectual Element in Unbelief': Maurice B. Reckitt on 'The Christian and the Welfare State': Prof. R. V. G. Tasker on 'The Complutensian Polyglot'. The reviews include a high commendation of Erik Routley's *Hymns and Human Life*.

Modern Churchman (March). The Editor salutes the memory of the late J. C. Hardwick, and Dr. Norman Sykes pays tribute to the late Charles Jenkinson in 'This Turbulent Priest': Dr. W. H. C. Frend writes on 'The Gnostic Origins of the Assumption Legend' and Dr. S. G. F. Brandon discusses Prof. Simon's recent work on Christian origins.

Expository Times (April) has Principal Lovell Cocks on Forsyth's *Person and Place of Jesus Christ*: Prof. John Gray on 'The Excavation of Ras Shamra': Dr. A. D. Harcus on 'Listening to Sermons'. (May.) Dr. Gray continues his account of the Excavation: Prof. D. M. Baillie writes on 'The Christological Theory of William Sanday': Dr. Lofthouse adds to an earlier contribution on '"I" and "We" in the Pauline Letters'.

Review of Religion (March) has 'The Concept of Tao in Chinese Culture' by Prof. Chung-Yuan Chang: 'The Visions of Thomas S. Jones' by Henry W. Wells: 'Criticism and Faith' by Prof. E. L. Allen, and the usual excellent reviews and Book Notes.

Huntington Library Quarterly (Feb.) has 'The Authorship and Ms. of *The Old Law* by Prof. George R. Price: '*Hudibras* considered as Satiric Allegory' by Prof. Ellen Leyburn: 'The Eighteenth Century Lives of Edmund Spencer' by Alec. C. Judson: 'John Wesley's Use of George Herbert' by Elsie A. Leach. Among the Notes is one on the Dickens-Wilkie Collins friendship.

Baptist Quarterly (Jan.) has an editorial notice of Dr. Douglas Horton's book on Congregationalism. Miss Jean Green writes on 'Sunday Schools of Today': Rev. D. Mervyn Himbury on 'Christ's Holy Community': Prof. John A. Moore on 'Johannes Brötli': the late Prin. P. W. Evans on 'The Baptismal Commission in *Matthew* xxviii, 19': Rev. A. Gilmore on 'Leenhardt on Baptism'.

Friends Quarterly (April) has 'The Well-Springs of Ministry' by Edgar G. Dunstan: 'Admission to Membership of Non-Pacifists' by Caroline Graveson: 'Quakerism on the European Continent' by Richard K. Ullmann: and interesting notes on 'The Great Revolution' by Dr. Vipont Brown (now 90) and 'One Generation to Another' by Elizabeth Fox Howard (now 80).